

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 337

24

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER SELECTED PROFESSIONS.

BY- MOLINARI, RALPH G. AND OTHERS

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, COLO.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-337

PUB DATE

66

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8178

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.18 HC-\$4.32 108P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STATE BOARDS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, *TEACHER CERTIFICATES, DENVER, COLORADO

COMPARISON OF THE COMPOSITION, CHARACTERISTICS, AND CURRENT LICENSING PRACTICES OF STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION WITH LICENSING PROGRAMS FOR SEVEN OTHER PROFESSIONS, (ACCOUNTANCY, ARCHITECTURE, DENTISTRY, ENGINEERING, LAW, MEDICINE, AND NURSING) WAS THE PURPOSE OF THIS NATIONWIDE STUDY. THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES WERE DIVIDED INTO THREE PHASES--(1) REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE, (2) SURVEY OF LICENSING BOARDS IN THE 50 STATES, AND (3) COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS WERE DEVELOPED AND USED FOR COLLECTING (1) PERSONAL DATA (AGE, SEX, TYPE OF BOARD MEMBERSHIP HELD, PROFESSIONAL STATUS, AND EDUCATION), (2) MAJOR BOARD CHARACTERISTICS (REGULATORY POWERS, QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP, AND LEGAL AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF BOARD), AND (3) MAJOR LICENSING PRACTICES (METHODS AND REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED UPON APPLICANT, LEGAL PROCEDURES USED BY A BOARD ISSUING LICENSES, AND METHODS OF POLICING PRACTITIONERS). DETAILED CONCLUSIONS WERE DISCUSSED AND PRESENTED IN THE REPORT. (GC)

ED 010337

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND
OTHER SELECTED PROFESSIONS**

Cooperative Research Project No. 5-8178 (S-337)

Conducted by:

Ralph G. Molinari

Under the Direction of:

M. Chester Nolte

and

Ralph A. Forsythe

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Composition of the licensing boards for the eight professions	2
Characteristics of the licensing boards	2
Current licensing practices of the licensing boards	2
Importance of the Study	3
Professional licensure	3
Professional autonomy	6
Method of Procedure	7
Review of literature	8
The survey of licensing boards in fifty states	8
Comparative analysis	9
Delimitations	10
Definition of Terms	10
License	10
Licensing board	10
Seven comparative professional groups	10
II. THE CONSTRUCTION AND FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	
FOR CURRENT BOARD COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS	11
Purpose of This Chapter	11
Construction of the Instruments	11

CHAPTER

PAGE

Rationale for items selected	11
Items selected	13
Clarification of the items	14
The first instrument	15
The second instrument	15
Selection of respondents	16
Follow-up	16
Organization of the Results of the Survey	16
Analysis of the Composition of State Licensing Boards .	17
Percentage of members' responses	17
Methods of obtaining membership	17
Membership by sex	20
Membership by age	20
Years served on the board	23
Occupational status of members	25
Years spent in practicing a profession or occupation	27
Highest degree attained	29
Degrees held in professional areas	31
Analysis of the Characteristics of State Licensing Boards	31
Percentage of boards' responses	31
The regulatory status of the boards	34
Codes of ethics	36
Size of state boards	38

CHAPTER

PAGE

Qualifications for board membership	40
Methods of attaining board membership	43
Average number of meetings held	45
State support of the boards	45
Methods by which boards were financed	48
Uses of fees	50
Methods by which members were remunerated	52
III. THE CONSTRUCTION AND FINDINGS OF THE INSTRUMENT FOR	
CURRENT LICENSING PRACTICES OF THE BOARDS	54
Purpose of This Chapter	54
Construction of the Instruments	54
Rationale for items selected	54
Items selected	56
Clarification of the items	56
The instrument	57
Selection of respondents	57
Organization of the Results of the Survey	58
Analysis of the Current Licensing Practices of State	
Licensing Boards	58
Methods by which applicants sought licensure	58
Requirements for licensure	60
Procedures used in granting licenses	63
Licensing procedures of the boards	65
Methods of license renewal	68
Licensing reciprocity	70

CHAPTER

PAGE

Appeals and to whom they were made	72
Frequency of appeals	75
IV. SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS	76
Purpose of This Chapter	76
Licensing Board Composition	76
Licensing Board Characteristics	80
Licensing Board Practices	86
Summary Tabulation of Findings	93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Percentage of Responses by Board Members on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	18
II. Methods by Which People Have Obtained Membership on State Licensing Boards in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	19
III. Membership by Sex on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	21
IV. Membership by Age on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	22
V. The Number of Years Which Board Members Served on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	24
VI. Occupational Status of Board Members on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	26
VII. The Number of Years Which Board Members on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States Were Practicing Their Profession or Occupation for 1966	28
VIII. Highest Degree Attained by Board Members on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	30

TABLE	PAGE
IX. Percentage of Members on State Licensing Boards Who Held Degrees in Their Professional Areas for 1966	32
X. Distribution of Boards Contacted and Boards Which Responded in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	33
XI. The Regulatory Status of Licensing Boards in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	35
XII. Codes of Ethics Established for the Practitioners in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	37
XIII. Range of Membership on State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	39
XIV. Qualifications Required for Board Membership on State Licensing Boards in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	41
XV. Qualifications Required for Board Membership on State Licensing Boards in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	44
XVI. Average Number of Meetings Held by State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	46
XVII. State Provision for Office Space and Staff for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	47
XVIII. Methods by Which State Licensing Boards Were Financed in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	49
XIX. Uses of Fees Collected by State Licensing Boards in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	51

TABLE	PAGE
XX. Methods by Which State Licensing Board Members were Remunerated in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	53
XXI. Methods by Which Application was Made to State Licensing Boards for Licenses in Eight Professions in the Fifty State for 1966	59
XXII. Licensing Requirements of State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	61
XXIII. Procedures by Which State Licensing Boards Granted Licen- ses in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	64
XXIV. Licensing Procedures of State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	66
XXV. Methods of Licensing Renewal by State Licensing Boards for Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	69
XXVI. Percentage of Licensing Boards Which Maintained Licensing Reciprocity in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	71
XXVII. Distribution of Appeals, and the Bodies to Which Appeals Were Made in Cases of License Refusal or Revocation in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	72a
XXVIII. Frequency of Appeals for Review of Licenses Which Were Refused or Revoked in Eight Professions in the Fifty States for 1966	73

TABLE

PAGE

XXIX. Summary of Findings Which Compared the Similarity and Dissimilarity of State Boards of Educational Admin- istration With the Boards For Seven Other Selected Professions	94
---	----

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

To achieve the essential task of establishing balance between freedom and order, state governments continuously sought ways of reconciling the demands of special groups with the public interest from the late eighteenth century to the twentieth century. One means by which states regulated and controlled special occupational groups, such as the professions, was licensure of the practitioner. Ordinarily, the licensing function was delegated to state boards specially created for this purpose. According to Fesler, some state licensing boards were controlled by the professions, while others were not. The degree of professional autonomy attained by some professions was in direct relationship to the extent of professional control over licensing.¹

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this nation-wide study was to compare the composition, characteristics, and current licensing practices of state licensing boards for educational administration with seven other professions; namely: accountancy, architecture, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, and nursing.

To establish the status of the boards, three major areas of inquiry were organized for examination. Specific factors in each of

¹James W. Fesler, The Independence of State Regulatory Agencies (Chicago: R. R. Donnelly and Sons Company, 1942), p. 46.

the three following areas were investigated to determine the boards' status.

Composition of the licensing boards for the eight professions.

This area of the survey determined:

1. the number of members required on the state licensing boards,
2. the proportion of men to women on state licensing boards,
3. the age ranges of board members,
4. the years served in board membership,
5. the occupational status of the board members,
6. the highest degrees attained by board members.

Characteristics of the licensing boards. This area of the survey determined:

1. how members were selected for board membership,
2. the dependency status of licensing boards,
3. the mechanics of issuing licenses used by the licensing boards,
4. the regulatory status of licensing boards,
5. qualifications for board membership,
6. the degree of state support of state licensing boards,
7. methods by which boards were financed,
8. methods by which board members were remunerated.

Current licensing practices of the licensing boards. This area of the survey determined:

1. standards for conferring licenses,
2. the status of comity, reciprocity, or license endorsement among the states in granting licenses within the same professions,

3. methods of license renewal,
4. the status of appeal procedures,
5. the frequency of appeals,
6. who held appeal hearings.

Importance of the Study

As a result of political pressure from the older professional societies during the period from the late eighteenth century to the early twentieth century, state governments enacted legislation which required the professions to license all practitioners.² This function was ordinarily delegated to professional licensing boards which were empowered to grant licenses, either at their discretion or when a legal, prearranged set of standards was met.³ The requirements varied from profession to profession because of the historical settings in which they were developed and the unique factors which distinguished each group from the other. In spite of the differences among professions, most have followed similar steps in their evolutionary development.⁴

Professional licensure. In 1910, professional persons constituted 4.7 per cent of the total labor force; 5.2 per cent in 1920; 6.7 per cent in 1930; 6.8 per cent in 1940. In 1950 and 1960, professional

²Council of State Governments, Occupational Licensing Legislation in the States (Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1952), p. 14.

³Fesler, op. cit., p. 47.

⁴T. M. Stinnett, The Teacher and Professional Organizations (third edition; Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956), p. 9.

persons constituted 8.0 per cent and 12.0 per cent, respectively, of the total labor force, or 4,342,880 and 7,156,800 people.⁵ Within the professional ranks of educational administration, there were 102,925 school administrators in 1963.⁶

In 1960 there were 7,324,906 accountants and auditors, 30,329 architects, 87,110 dentists, 869,716 technical engineers, 209,684 lawyers and judges, 590,569 nurses and 230,307 physicians and surgeons.⁷

In 1952, the Council of State Governments reported that the states enacted legislation which required education and/or experience qualifications and licensure as conditions of entrance into the practice of approximately seventy-five occupations.⁸ The 3,750 licensing boards for the seventy-five professions wielded considerable state given power.

Prior to 1949 only limited examination and study were made of licensing boards, although their operation involved several thousand persons. The United States Office of Education conducted a survey of state departments of education in 1949, in which the general composition

⁵United States Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1930. Sixty-first number (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930), p. 57; United States Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1944-45. Sixty-sixth number (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945), p. 57; United States Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1965. 86th Annual edition (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 121.

⁶United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963-64), p. 28.

⁷United States Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population: 1960. Occupational Characteristics, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 1-2.

⁸Council of State Governments, op. cit., p. 12.

of state boards of education was determined.⁹ A trend was developing toward appointment of board members by state governors. It was indicated that in order to represent the people well, a board should have nine to twelve members. Four states required some of the board members to be professional educators, while nine states had no state boards of education at all.

In 1926 Schrammel conducted a study of the organization of state departments of education.¹⁰ His findings on the organization of state boards of education indicated that the number of these boards increased from twenty-nine to forty-one between 1890 and 1925. Earlier, most of the boards were composed chiefly of appointive-ex officio members. By 1925, with the exception of the state superintendent and the governor, ex officio members were almost entirely eliminated. The appointment of members who did not hold ex officio memberships was vested in the governor in nearly all states.

Schrammel indicated that a board from five to nine members could work efficiently without domination by one person, and still be adequately representative of the people. In most cases, board members were compensated for expenses. No conclusions as to board functions were drawn, except that state boards of education control all of the educational interests in some of the states.

⁹Fred F. Beach and Andrew A. Gibbs, The Structure of State Departments of Education, Federal Security Agency, United States Office of Education, Misc., No. 10 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), pp. 3-8.

¹⁰Henry E. Schrammel, Organization of State Departments of Education (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1926), pp. 12-23.

Fesler made a general study of state regulatory agencies in which he tried to determine the effect of professional autonomy and regulation upon (1) the professions being licensed, and (2) the public interest.¹¹ He concluded that: (1) some sort of liaison or channel of communication should be established between the professional specialists on the boards and the public interest, (2) the requirements for professional candidates should be raised no higher than to keep out the inefficient, (3) the government should impose more effective means of control over the professions.

Lieberman pointed out that the factors causing growth in the ranks of professional groups and the evolving forces which determined their occupational status could be applied to upgrade the profession of education. The licensing characteristics were important with respect to their effect on professional control of the practitioner.¹²

Professional autonomy. As a result of the Flexner report in 1910, the medical profession was able to raise its professional standards and attain a status of professional autonomy it had not before achieved.¹³ The same effect was achieved for the dental profession after the 1926 Gies report.¹⁴ A major part of this autonomy was in the

¹¹Fesler, op. cit., pp. 46-60.

¹²Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1956), pp. 95-105.

¹³Abraham Flexner, Medical Education in the United States and Canada (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910), p. 346.

¹⁴William J. Gies, Dental Education in the United States and Canada (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1926), p. 692.

hands of the state and national associations. Fesler indicated that state licensing boards for each of these professions were delegated control over entry into and expulsion from the professions. Standards of performance within the professional group were also upheld by these boards.¹⁵

Fensch and Wilson observed that as the American community changed from a rural to an urban one, there was a corresponding increase in population, there was a demand for increased specialized school administrative services, and there was a constant consolidation of school districts which was taking place. The implication was that greater professionalization of the educational administrator was necessary.¹⁶ Could the profession upgrade itself by means of the current scope of licensing autonomy it possessed?

There was a growing abundance of literature directly related to many aspects of the expanding professional group. Want of literature dealing with the comparative development of the licensing phase of educational administration evidenced the need for the study.

Method of Procedure

Basic research procedure utilized in this study was the descriptive survey, which was divided into three phases: (1) review of literature, (2) survey of licensing boards in the fifty states, and (3) comparative analysis of the composition, characteristics, and

¹⁵Fesler, op. cit., pp. 46-55.

¹⁶Edwin Fensch and Robert Wilson, The Superintendency Team (Columbus: Merrill, 1964), 147 pp.

licensing practices of the state licensing boards for educational administration with accountancy, architecture, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, and nursing. The review of literature, the survey, and the comparative analysis were accomplished by the following procedure.

Review of literature. The objective of the first phase was to establish the rationale for the items to be used in the survey instruments. The review of literature indicated that certain specific factors delineated board composition, characteristics and licensing practices. These reviews were placed at the beginning of Chapter II and Chapter III.

The survey of licensing boards in fifty states. The purpose of the second, or survey phase, was to determine the current status of the (1) board members, (2) licensing boards, and (3) licensing procedures of the eight professions. Data were collected by means of two survey instruments. The items used in the instruments were formulated by reviewing the literature and then presenting them for criticism and refinement to four persons recognized as authorities in the field of licensure and state licensing boards. By means of the first instrument, personal data were collected from members of the state licensing boards. By means of the second instrument, data related to board characteristics and licensing practices were collected from the board secretaries. State departments of education, state directories, statutes, and state licensing board chairmen also helped in collecting data about state licensing boards.

The instruments were administered to all board members and board secretaries. The data collected from the instruments were placed on

data collection sheets for investigation. The findings were then reported in tabular form. As a result, the composition, characteristics, entrance requirements, and licensing procedures and practices of each profession were determined.

There were 1,673 copies of the first instrument which were forwarded to the members on 397 state licensing boards. Tabulations indicated that 89.4 per cent, or 1,495 instruments were returned. There were 397 copies of the second instrument which were forwarded to the board secretaries. Tabulations indicated that 265 instruments, or 66.8 per cent of the total were returned.

The composition of the boards' membership was examined by means of grouping and tabulating such characteristics as age, sex, board status, educational, occupational, and professional background.

The characteristics of the boards were established through tabulating personal qualifications required of board members, methods of gaining board membership, and board financial procedures.

The licensing practices of the boards were established by tabulating: methods of applying for licenses; methods of granting licenses; degree of responsibility for issuance of licenses; period for which license was issued; age of licensee; moral requirements; educational and experiential requirements. A tabulation was also made of the codes of ethics controlling the boards, comity and/or reciprocity, and the procedure used in cases of appeal.

Comparative analysis. The purpose of the last phase was to compare educational administration with seven other professions. The composition, characteristics, and licensing practices of the state

licensing boards for educational administration obtained in step two were compared with the state licensing boards of the seven other professions.

Delimitations

It was not the purpose of this study to: determine whether or not a monopoly existed in each profession; review the educational requirements for licensure in each profession; examine, evaluate, or question the efficiency of operations or the effectiveness of the policies of state licensing boards.

Definition of Terms

License. Licensing in this study referred to a regulatory device by which the state protected the people from injury to health, security, and welfare by allowing professional groups to set up standards of admission to and internal control of their ranks.¹⁷

Licensing board. A licensing board in this study consisted of an official state group which issued licenses for admission to practice in a profession.¹⁸

Seven comparative professional groups. The seven professional groups which were compared to educational administration in this study were (1) accountancy, (2) architecture, (3) dentistry, (4) engineering, (5) law, (6) medicine, and (7) nursing.

¹⁷Henry Campbell Black, Black's Law Dictionary (fourth edition; St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1951), p. 1067.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 219.

CHAPTER II

THE CONSTRUCTION AND FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS FOR CURRENT BOARD COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS

Purpose of This Chapter

The purpose of this chapter was to survey and compare the composition and characteristics of state licensing boards for educational administration with seven other professions. A review of the literature revealed a narrow variety of factors by which state licensing boards were reviewed. These factors were compiled, classified, and summarized into a comprehensive set of items by which the composition and characteristics of state licensing boards were determined. Further verification of the items was accomplished through the involvement of four persons recognized as authorities in the area of licensure and state licensing boards.

Next, two data collecting instruments were developed. The first instrument was sent to members of state licensing boards. The second instrument was sent to the executive secretaries of state licensing boards. The returned data were put onto data collection sheets. These compilations were then tabulated. The rest of the chapter was devoted to the results of the tabulations dealing with board composition and characteristics.

Construction of the Instruments

Rationale for items selected. The review of literature indicated that certain specific factors distinctly delineated board composition

and characteristics. Will,¹ Stinnett and Huggett,² Lieberman,³ and the Council of State Governments⁴ sought to determine what the proper role of a state licensing board was in relation to the profession and the needs which it served. Those factors considered to be pertinent to state board composition and characteristics were presented below.

Lieberman stated that " . . . the soundest procedure, and one generally advocated in the established professions, is for a state board, composed of practitioners of the profession itself. . . ."⁵ He pointed out that except for education, most of the professions in the United States have steadily moved toward this criteria of professionalization for almost half a century.

Will⁶ examined the characteristics of state boards for educational administration in terms of the following factors:

1. the occupational status of the board member,
2. the term of office on the board,
3. special requirements for board membership, e.g., age, sex, education,

¹Robert F. Will, State Education: Structure and Organization United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, United States Office of Education, Misc. No. 46 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964), pp. 12-14.

²T. M. Stinnett and Albert J. Huggett, Professional Problems of Teachers (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), pp. 466-470.

³Myron Lieberman, op. cit., p. 95.

⁴The Council of State Governments, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

⁵Myron Lieberman, op. cit., p. 92.

⁶Robert F. Will, op. cit., pp. 12-17.

4. the methods of selecting board members,
5. the size of the board,
6. the legal status of the board, e.g., board services, methods of finance, remuneration of member, uses of fees,
7. the regulatory powers of the board (in granting licenses),
8. the degree of board independence.

The Council of State Governments used factors dealing with professional reputation. It compared state boards of education with the state boards for ten other occupations.⁷

Lieberman felt that proper board evaluation must include " . . . the way in which the professional representatives on the licensing boards are selected. . . ."⁸ A profession was guided by a code of ethics, and, therefore, the licensing board was also to be guided by this ethical code.⁹

Schrammel¹⁰ examined the historical development of state boards of education in terms of: (1) board composition, (2) board size, (3) legal status of board members, (4) legal qualifications of board members, and (5) compensation of board members.

Items selected. The items which were derived from the review of literature were divided into two categories.

⁷The Council of State Governments, op. cit., pp. 84-89.

⁸Lieberman, op. cit., p. 95.

⁹Ibid., p. 96.

¹⁰Henry E. Schrammel, op. cit., pp. 4-15.

The first category, composition of state boards, consisted of four basic items:

1. board membership,
2. length of board service,
3. professional or occupational status,
4. educational background.

The second category, characteristics of state boards, consisted of eight items:

1. qualification for membership,
2. methods of attaining board membership,
3. board size (in membership),
4. remuneration of board members,
5. number of yearly meetings,
6. code of ethics,
7. board regulation powers,
8. state control of board functions.

Clarification of the items. To refine and clarify the basic items, the two categories were presented to four persons who were widely experienced with state licensing boards.

1. Mrs. M. Annie Leitch, Director, American Nursing Association Program for State Boards of Nursing.
2. Dr. M. H. Crabb, Secretary, The Federation of State Medical Boards.
3. Mr. C. R. Locke, Director, National Conference of Bar Examiners.

4. Dean L. Gustavson, Chairman, National Council of Architectural Registration Boards.

Each person was asked to criticize and offer suggestions dealing with board composition and qualifications for membership.

The items were next presented to the author's dissertation advisor, Dr. M. Chester Nolte, and Dr. Ralph A. Forsythe, the Associate Director of the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Denver for further criticism and suggestions.

As a result of the clarification and suggestions, modifications were made in the two major categories of items. It was suggested that the first category ought to include the various methods by which board members acquired their posts, the age and sex groups to which members belonged. The second category was expanded to include methods by which boards were financed, and how they disposed of their fees.

The first instrument. An instrument was developed which set forth five major items with twelve subsections. The personal data sought included: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) type of board membership held, (4) professional status, and (5) education.

The second instrument. A second instrument was designed, consisting of eighteen major items with ninety-two subsections. It included items for both characteristics and current licensing practices of state boards. The major characteristics sought included: (1) regulatory powers, (2) qualifications for membership, (3) legal and financial status of the board. The items and findings for board procedures were reviewed in Chapter IV of this study.

Selection of respondents. The Colorado boards for the eight professions involved in the study were contacted in order to acquire the names and addresses of the executive secretaries and members on the other state licensing boards. During the months of October and November 1965, letters were written to 397 board secretaries and 1,673 members explaining the purpose of the study. The importance of their cooperation in completing the instruments was emphasized.

Follow-up. During the autumn, 1965 waiting period, 223 board secretaries and 1,145 board members responded and agreed to cooperate in the study. In January, 1966, follow-up letters were sent out to those secretaries and board members who did not respond to the initial letters. Of the 175 and 528 follow-up letters sent to board secretaries and board members, respectively, 42 additional secretaries and 350 additional board members agreed to cooperate. Of the total, 132 board secretaries and 178 board members did not respond. At the end of February, 1966, the instruments were forwarded to 265 board secretaries and 1,495 board members.

Organization of the Results of the Survey

Results of the first instrument and that part of the second instrument dealing with board characteristics were reported in the remainder of Chapter II. The data received were placed on data collection sheets. The findings were organized into twenty tables: (1) eight dealt with board composition, (2) ten dealt with board characteristics, and (3) two indicated the number of responses.

Analysis of the Composition of State Licensing Boards

Percentage of members' responses. There were 1,673 instruments which were forwarded to the members on 397 state licensing boards. It was shown in Table I that 89.4 per cent, or 1,495 members, returned instruments. The mean number of members contacted per professional group was 209.1; the mean number of respondents was 186.9 members, or 89.5 per cent per professional group.

Between 94.2 and 100.0 per cent of the boards for each professional group except medicine and educational administration returned the instruments dealing with board composition.

The educational administration group was sent 324 instruments. There were 210 respondents, or 64.8 per cent of the members, who returned completed copies. It was observed that the returns for educational administration were 25.6 per cent less than for all professional groups as a whole. The medical group returned 85.3 per cent.

Methods of obtaining membership. Table II revealed that there were three major methods by which people were able to obtain board membership: (1) through an ex officio status, (2) appointment by the governor, and (3) election.

Of the three methods cited above, 1,138 members, or 76.1 per cent of all respondents, were appointed by the governors of their states. There were 99 respondents, or 6.6 per cent who were elected and 6 respondents, or 0.4 per cent who were ex officio members.

At least 82.9 per cent or more of the members for each of the accountancy, architecture, dentistry, engineering, medicine, and nursing

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE BY BOARD MEMBERS ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total members contacted	Total members who responded	Percentage of members who responded
Accountancy	165	158	95.8
Architecture	166	166	100.0
Dentistry	163	163	100.0
Engineering	182	182	100.0
Law	206	194	94.2
Medicine	231	197	85.3
Nursing	236	225	95.3
Educational Administration	324	210	64.8
Totals	1673	1495	89.4
Mean response	209.1	186.9	89.5

TABLE II

METHODS BY WHICH PEOPLE HAVE OBTAINED MEMBERSHIP ON
STATE LICENSING BOARDS IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS
IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total re-spondents	Ex officio member of the board		Appoint-ment by governor		Elected		Other*		Did not respond to question	
		Per		Per		Per		Per		Per	
		No.	cent	No.	cent	No.	cent	No.	cent	No.	cent
Accountancy	158	1	0.6	144	91.2	0	0.0	13	8.2	0	0.0
Architecture	166	0	0	161	97.0	0	0	5	3.0	0	0
Dentistry	163	0	0	135	82.8	26	16.0	2	1.2	0	0
Engineering	182	0	0	171	93.9	0	0	7	3.9	4	2.2
Law	194	0	0	1	.5	11	5.7	180**	92.8	2	1.0
Medicine	197	0	0	177	89.8	13	6.6	7	3.6	0	0
Nursing	225	0	0	206	91.6	1	.4	18	8.0	0	0
Educational Administration	210	5	2.4	143	68.0	48	22.9	13	6.2	1	0.5
Totals	1495	6		1138		99		245		7	
Per cent of Total	100		0.4		76.1		6.6		16.4		0.5

*Director Department of Commerce
Director Department of Business Regulation

**Bar Commission Appointment
State Supreme Court Appointment

groups were appointed by the state governors. In contrast, 143 members, or 68.0 per cent of the respondents of the educational administration group, were appointed.

In the law group, 180 members, or 92.8 per cent of the respondents, were appointed by the state bar commission or the state supreme court. Other methods of acquiring board membership, which included appointment by directors of state departments of commerce, by state civil service, by directors of state departments of business regulation, ranged between 1.2 per cent and 8.2 per cent of the respondents for each professional group except law. No respondents, except 0.6 per cent and 2.4 per cent of the members in accountancy and educational administration, respectively, were ex officio members of the boards.

Membership by sex. Table III revealed that 1,237 members, or 82.7 per cent of all respondents, were male. The male membership on the boards for accountancy, architecture, dentistry, engineering, law, and medicine ranged from 98.7 to 100.0 per cent within each group.

In the educational administration group 175 members, or 83.3 per cent of the respondents, were male, and 33 members, or 15.7 per cent, were female.

Membership by age. Table IV was divided into six ranges. Three ranges indicated that 1,308 members, or 87.5 per cent of all respondents, were between the ages of 36-65. The 36-45 range comprised 21.8 per cent, the 46-55 range comprised 36.1 per cent, and the 56-65 range comprised 29.6 per cent of all professional groups.

TABLE III

**MEMBERSHIP BY SEX ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966**

Professional Group	Total respondents	Male		Female		Did not respond to question	
	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	156	98.7	0	0	2	1.3
Architecture	166	166	100	0	0	0	0
Dentistry	163	163	100	0	0	0	0
Engineering	182	181	99.5	1	.5	0	0
Law	194	192	99.0	1	.5	1	.5
Medicine	197	195	99.0	1	.5	1	.5
Nursing	225	9	4.0	216	96.0	0	0
Educational Administration	210	175	83.3	33	15.7	2	1.0
Totals	1495	1237		252		6	
Per Cent of Total	100		82.7		16.9		0.4

TABLE IV

MEMBERSHIP BY AGE ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total respond- ents	Age groups of board members:											
		under 25		26-35		36-45		46-55		56-65		66-over	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	0	0	8	5.1	44	27.9	62	39.2	31	19.6	13	8.2
Architecture	166	0	0	1	.6	26	15.7	62	37.4	60	36.1	17	10.2
Dentistry	163	0	0	1	.6	51	31.3	56	34.4	47	28.8	8	4.9
Engineering	182	0	0	0	0	15	8.3	59	32.4	81	44.5	27	14.8
Law	194	0	0	16	8.2	49	25.3	54	27.8	50	25.8	25	12.9
Medicine	197	0	0	1	.5	30	15.2	72	36.6	72	36.6	22	11.1
Nursing	225	0	0	9	4.0	66	29.3	103	45.8	43	19.1	4	1.8
Educational Administration	210	0	0	7	3.3	45	21.4	72	34.3	58	27.6	28	13.4
Totals	1495	0		43		326		540		442		144	
Per Cent of Total	100	0			2.9		21.8		36.1		29.6		9.6

For all professional groups there were no members in the under 25 range, 2.9 per cent in the 26-35 range and 9.6 per cent in the 66-over-range.

The percentage of members in the seven comparative professional groups who were between the ages of 36 and 65 ranged between a low of 78.9 per cent for law and 94.5 per cent for dentistry. The respondents for educational administration who were between the ages of 36-65 comprised 175 members, or 83.3 per cent of the professional group; 21.4 per cent in the 36-45 range; 34.3 per cent in the 46-55 range; 27.6 per cent in the 56-65 range.

Years served on the board. Table V was divided into five ranges for the years which members served on state boards. It was indicated that 1,015 members, or 67.9 per cent of all respondents, served on the board from 2-10 years. The table further showed that 218 members, or 14.6 per cent of all respondents, served on the boards from 0-1 year, that 184 members, or 12.3 per cent of the respondents, served on the boards from 11-20 years.

The percentage of members who served on the boards from 2-10 years in each of the seven comparative professional groups ranged between a low of 58.2 per cent for law and a high of 79.8 per cent for dentistry. The percentage of members who served on the boards from 0-1 year ranged between 7.7 per cent for medicine and 24.7 per cent for accountancy, while the members who served on the boards from 11-20 years ranged between 2.7 per cent for nursing and 19.8 per cent for medicine in each of the comparative groups.

TABLE V

THE NUMBER OF YEARS WHICH BOARD MEMBERS SERVED ON STATE LICENSING
BOARDS FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total respondents	0-1 year		2-10 years		11-20 years		21-25 years		Over 25 years		Did not respond to question	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	39	24.7	108	68.4	8	5.0	0	0	3	1.9	0	0
Architecture	166	23	13.9	116	69.8	19	11.5	5	3.0	1	.6	2	1.2
Dentistry	163	17	10.4	130	79.8	11	6.8	2	1.2	3	1.8	0	0
Engineering	182	23	12.6	117	64.3	32	17.6	3	1.6	7	3.9	0	0
Law	194	28	14.4	113	58.2	30	15.5	2	1.0	10	5.2	11	5.7
Medicine	197	15	7.7	135	68.5	39	19.8	4	2.0	2	1.0	2	1.0
Nursing	225	45	20.0	172	76.5	6	2.7	1	.4	1	.4	0	0
Educational Administration	210	28	13.4	124	59.0	39	18.6	6	2.8	1	.5	12	5.7
Totals	1495	218		1015		184		23		28		27	
Per Cent of Total	100		14.6		67.9		12.3		1.5		1.9		1.8

It was observed that 124 members, or 59.0 per cent of the respondents for educational administration, served on the boards from 2-10 years; 28 members, or 13.4 per cent, and 39 members, or 18.6 per cent, respectively, served on the boards from 0-1 year and 11-20 years.

Occupational status of members. Table VI was divided into three major categories: professional practitioners, lay people, and other professional groups. Professional practitioners, 1,231 in number, comprised 82.3 per cent of all respondents. It was observed that 173 members, or 11.6 per cent of the respondents were lay people, while 35 members, or 2.3 per cent of the respondents were members of other professional groups.

It was indicated that the percentage of board members in the seven comparative professions who were practitioners of the professions being licensed ranged between 84.2 per cent for engineering and 98.0 per cent for medicine. Lay people on the boards in these seven groups ranged between 0 per cent for architecture, dentistry, and law, and 2.5 per cent for accountancy, while representation from "other professional groups" ranged between 0 per cent for dentistry, engineering, and law and 3.0 per cent for architecture.

In the educational administration group, 20 members, or 9.5 per cent of the group's respondents were practitioners of educational administration. Lay people on the boards for this group comprised 163 members, or 77.6 per cent of the respondents, while representation from "other professional groups" comprised 21 members, or 10.0 per cent of the respondents.

TABLE VI

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF BOARD MEMBERS ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Occupations of board members included:										
	Total respondents	professional practitioners	retired practitioners	lay people*	other professional groups**	those who did not respond					
	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	148	93.7	2	1.3	4	2.5	3	1.9	1	0.6
Architecture	166	157	94.6	3	1.8	0	0	5	3.0	1	.6
Dentistry	163	159	97.6	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	2	1.2
Engineering	182	153	84.2	13	7.1	1	.5	0	0	15	8.2
Law	194	186	95.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4.1
Medicine	197	193	98.0	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.0	0	0
Nursing	225	215	95.5	2	.9	4	1.8	4	1.8	0	0
Educational Administration	210	20	9.5	5	2.4	163	77.6	21	10.0	1	0.5
Totals	1495	1231		28		173		35		28	
Per Cent of Total	100		82.3		1.9		11.6		2.3		1.9

* Business executive; retired worker; entrepreneur; executive secretary; clerk; housewife; unemployed; student; farmer

**Lawyer; engineer; college president, columnist; educator

Years spent in practicing a profession or occupation. Table VII was divided into five ranges: 0-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years, 31-40 years, and 41-more years. It was revealed that 1,235 members, or 82.6 per cent of the respondents were in the three ranges from 11-40 years: 30.3 per cent fell in the 11-20 range; 29.4 per cent fell in the 21-30 range; 22.9 per cent fell in the 31-40 range.

The percentage of respondents in the seven comparative groups who practiced their professions from 11-40 years ranged between 74.2 per cent for law and 93.4 per cent for nursing; the respondents in these groups who practiced from 11-20 years ranged between 13.2 per cent for engineering and 45.6 per cent for accountancy; the respondents in these groups who practiced from 21-30 years ranged between 20.1 per cent for law and 44.0 per cent for nursing; the respondents in these groups who practiced from 31-40 years ranged between 10.7 per cent for accountancy and 28.3 per cent for dentistry.

In the educational administration group, 139 members, or 66.2 per cent of the respondents, practiced their professions or occupations from 11-40 years. There were 54 respondents, or 25.7 per cent who practiced from 11-20 years, 46 respondents, or 21.9 per cent who practiced from 21-30 years, and 39 respondents, or 18.6 per cent, who practiced from 31-40 years.

Table VI indicated that only 20 members, or 9.5 per cent of the respondents were practitioners of educational administration, while 184 members, or 87.6 per cent were lay people or members of other professions.

TABLE VII

THE NUMBER OF YEARS WHICH BOARD MEMBERS ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES WERE PRACTICING THEIR
PROFESSION OR OCCUPATION FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total respondents	0-10 years			11-20 years			21-30 years			31-40 years			41-more years			Did not respond to question		
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	11	7.0	72	45.6	47	29.7	17	10.7	11	7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Architecture	166	7	4.2	65	39.2	40	24.1	41	24.7	13	7.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dentistry	163	3	1.8	51	31.3	51	31.3	46	28.3	9	5.5	3	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	182	3	1.6	24	13.2	50	27.5	66	36.3	39	21.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law	194	21	10.8	59	30.4	39	20.1	46	23.7	26	13.4	3	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medicine	197	6	3.1	53	26.9	67	34.0	52	26.4	17	8.6	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing	225	12	5.3	76	33.8	99	44.0	35	15.6	3	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational Administration	210	28	13.4	54	25.7	46	21.9	39	18.6	24	11.4	19	9.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	1495	91		454		439		342		142		27							
Per Cent of Total	100		6.1		30.3		29.4		22.9		9.5		1.8						

In the law and the educational administration groups 21 members, or 10.8 per cent, and 28 members, or 13.4 per cent, practiced their professions or occupations from 0-10 years, respectively. In the engineering, law, and educational administration groups, 39 members, or 21.4 per cent, 26 members, or 13.4 per cent, and 24 members, or 11.4 per cent, respectively, were practicing their professions or occupations 41-more years.

Highest degree attained. Table VIII revealed that 877 members, or 58.7 per cent of all respondents, held graduate degrees, whereas 498 members, or 33.3 per cent held undergraduate degrees.

It was observed that in the seven comparative professions the percentage of respondents who held undergraduate degrees ranged between a low of 1.5 per cent for medicine and a high of 69.2 per cent for architecture. Those respondents in the seven groups who held graduate degrees ranged between a low of 19.3 per cent for architecture and a high of 98.8 per cent for dentistry. The medical and dental groups, respectively, had a membership in which 98.0 per cent and 98.8 per cent of the respondents held graduate degrees. The members of the other five comparative groups who held graduate degrees varied between a low of 19.3 per cent in architecture and a high of 76.8 per cent in law.

In the educational administration group 76 members, or 36.2 per cent of the respondents, held undergraduate degrees. The 107 members who held graduate degrees amounted to 50.9 per cent of all respondents for this group.

TABLE VIII

HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED BY BOARD MEMBERS ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total respondents	No degree		Under graduate degree		Graduate degree	
	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	28	17.7	96	60.8	34	21.5
Architecture	166	19	11.5	115	69.2	32	19.3
Dentistry	163	0	0	2	1.2	161	98.8
Engineering	182	12	6.6	111	61.0	59	32.4
Law	194	3	1.6	42	21.6	149	76.8
Medicine	197	1	.5	3	1.5	193	98.0
Nursing	225	30	13.3	53	23.6	142	63.1
Educational Administration	210	27	12.9	76	36.2	107	50.9
Totals	1495	120		498		877	
Per Cent of Total	100		8.0		33.3		58.7

Degrees held in professional areas. Table IX revealed that 1,103 members, or 73.8 per cent of all respondents, earned degrees in their professional areas.

The members who held degrees in their professional areas in each of the seven comparative professions, except accountancy, ranged between 76.9 per cent for nursing and 96.3 per cent for dentistry.

The members who did not hold degrees in their professional areas in the seven groups ranged between a low of 3.7 per cent for dentistry and a high of 44.3 per cent for accountancy.

In contrast, 15 members, or 7.5 per cent of the respondents in the educational administration group, held degrees in their professional area; 92.9 per cent of the respondents did not hold degrees in educational administration.

The accountancy group had 88 members, or 55.7 per cent of the group's respondents, who held degrees in their professional area.

Analysis of the Characteristics of State Licensing Boards

Percentage of boards' responses. There were 397 instruments which were forwarded to the executive secretaries of state licensing boards for eight professions in fifty states. It was shown in Table X that 265 completed instruments, or 66.8 per cent of the total, were returned.

It was indicated that the boards for the seven comparative professions which returned the instruments dealing with board characteristics and licensing practices, ranged between a low of 54.0 per cent for dentistry and a high of 74.0 for nursing. In contrast, 40 boards,

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE OF MEMBERS ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS WHO HELD
DEGREES IN THEIR PROFESSIONAL AREAS FOR 1966

Professional Group	Did members hold degrees in their professional areas?				
	Total respondents	Yes		No	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	158	88	55.7	70	44.3
Architecture	166	144	86.7	22	13.3
Dentistry	163	157	96.3	6	3.7
Engineering	182	162	89.0	20	11.0
Law	194	181	93.3	13	6.7
Medicine	197	183	92.9	14	7.1
Nursing	225	173	76.9	52	23.1
Educational Administration	210	15	7.1	195	92.9
Totals	1495	1103		392	
Per Cent of Total	100		73.8		26.2

TABLE X

DISTRIBUTION OF BOARDS CONTACTED AND BOARDS WHICH RESPONDED
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total number boards contacted	Total boards which responded	Percentage of the boards which responded
Accountancy	50	35	70.0
Architecture	50	31	62.0
Dentistry	50	27	54.0
Engineering	50	31	62.0
Law	50	33	66.0
Medicine	50	31	62.0
Nursing	50	37	74.0
Educational Administration	47	40	85.1
Totals	397	265	
Mean Average	49.6	33.1	
Per Cent of Total Responding	100		66.8

or 85.1 per cent of the educational administration group, responded. The mean average response per professional group was 33.1, whereas, 40 boards for the educational administration group responded.

The regulatory status of the boards. Table XI revealed that 105 boards, or 77.4 per cent of the respondents, were independent bodies. Within this category, 188 boards, or 70.9 per cent of the total, were independent boards which were empowered to issue licenses. It was indicated that 60 boards, or 22.6 per cent of the respondents, were advisory bodies.

It was observed that between a low of 60.7 per cent and a high of 90.0 per cent of the boards for the seven comparative professions were independent bodies. Within this category, except for law, the boards for the comparative groups which were empowered to issue licenses ranged between 67.7 per cent for architecture and 87.1 per cent for medicine. The number of boards in the law group which were independent bodies empowered to issue licenses were 15, or 45.5 per cent of the total of the respondents.

The boards for the seven comparative professions which were advisory bodies ranged between a low of 7.4 per cent and a high of 36.3 per cent. Within this category, the boards for the comparative groups which were empowered to issue licenses ranged between 0 per cent for law and 25.8 per cent for architecture. In the law group, 8 boards, or 24.2 per cent of the respondents were solely advisory bodies.

In the educational administration group, there were 39 boards, or 90.0 per cent of the respondents which were independent bodies. Within this category, 29 boards, or 72.5 per cent of the respondents,

TABLE XI

THE REGULATORY STATUS OF LICENSING BOARDS IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	The board:									
	was an independent body which was:					was an advisory body which:				
	Total boards which responded	empowered to issue licenses, but dependent upon another agency					was sole advisory			
	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.
Accountancy	35	26	74.2	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	5
Architecture	31	21	67.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Dentistry	27	19	70.4	0	0	1	3.7	3	11.1	1
Engineering	31	24	77.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Law	33	15	45.5	1	3.0	2	6.1	2	6.1	0
Medicine	31	27	87.1	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	2
Nursing	37	27	73.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Educational Administration	40	29	72.5	5	12.5	2	5.0	0	0	0
Totals	265	188	70.9	6	2.3	5	1.9	6	2.3	11
Per Cent Response	100									

* Department of Education; Department of Professional and Vocational Studies; Division of Registration; Department of Health; Department of Commerce for Finances; Department of Law and Public Safety; State Department of Banking and Insurance; Division of Professional Licenses

**State agency; administrative body under state statute; regulatory body; examining body only

were independent bodies which were empowered to issue licenses. In the category of advisory boards, 1 board, or 2.5 per cent of the boards for educational administration, were solely advisory.

Codes of ethics. Table XII was divided into five major areas in order to determine if a code of ethics was established and if so, by what body. The data revealed that 237 boards, or 89.4 per cent of all respondents, adhered to codes of ethics. Within this category, 101 boards, or 38.1 per cent of the respondents adhered to a code of ethics established by the national professional associations; 52 boards, or 19.6 per cent of the respondents, adhered to codes of ethics established by the boards. State professional societies, state supreme courts, state professional schools, and state statutes were "other bodies" which established codes of ethics to which 58 boards, or 21.9 per cent of the respondents, adhered.

It was indicated that the percentage of boards in each of the seven comparative professions which adhered to codes of ethics established by the national professional associations ranged between a low of 0 per cent in accountancy and a high of 86.5 per cent in nursing. The percentage of the boards in each of the seven professions which adhered to codes of ethics established by the boards ranged between a low of 0 per cent in law and a high of 48.5 per cent in accountancy. The percentage of boards in the seven professions which adhered to codes of ethics established by "other bodies" ranged between a low of 0 per cent in architecture and a high of 69.7 per cent in law. The law group usually adhered to codes of ethics established jointly by the state professional societies and the state supreme courts.

TABLE XII
CODES OF ETHICS ESTABLISHED FOR THE PRACTITIONERS IN EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

A code of ethics was established for the practitioner by:																	
Professional Group	Total boards which responded	the board			the national association			the board and the national association			the state professional association			other bodies*		no response	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		
Accountancy	35	17	48.5	0	0	8	22.9	0	0	6	17.2	4	11.4				
Architecture	31	11	35.4	12	38.7	4	13.0	1	3.2	0	0	3	9.7				
Dentistry	27	1	3.7	8	29.7	4	14.8	2	7.4	9	33.3	3	11.1				
Engineering	31	11	35.4	12	38.7	2	6.5	0	0	2	6.5	4	12.9				
Law	33	0	0	9	27.3	0	0	0	0	23	69.7	1	3.0				
Medicine	31	9	29.0	8	25.8	2	6.5	2	6.5	10	32.2	0	0				
Nursing	37	2	5.4	32	86.5	0	0	0	0	2	5.4	1	2.7				
Educational Administration	40	1	2.5	20	50.0	0	0	1	2.5	6	15.0	12	30.0				
Totals	265	52	19.6	101	38.1	20	7.6	6	2.2	58	21.9	28	10.6				
Per Cent of Total	100																
Mean Response	33.1	6.5		12.6		2.5		0.8		7.3		3.5					

* State professional society and the state supreme court, jointly; state school of medicine; local professional society; state statutes

In the educational administration group, 20 boards, or 50.0 per cent of the respondents, adhered to a code of ethics established by the national association; 2 boards, or 2.5 per cent of the respondents, adhered to codes of ethics established by the boards; 6 boards, or 15.0 per cent of the respondents, adhered to codes of ethics established by "other bodies."

Size of state boards. Table XIII indicated that the mean average membership for all boards responding was 6.0 members per board. The mean average membership for each professional group varied from 1.3 below to 2.0 above the mean average for all respondents.

The actual membership on the boards in each of the seven comparative professions ranged between a minimum of 3 members for all groups and a maximum of 16 members for law and medicine. The mean average membership for each of the seven groups ranged between 4.7 members for accountancy and 7.5 members for medicine. No boards had less than a minimum of three members, but some were twice as large as others; e.g., some dental boards had eight members, others had sixteen.

In the educational administration group, the actual membership on the boards ranged from 3 to 21 members. The mean average membership for the group was 8.0 members. The maximum size of several boards of educational administration were almost three times as large as boards in the seven other professional groups.

TABLE XIII

RANGE OF MEMBERSHIP ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Range of board membership				
Professional Group	Total boards which responded	Minimum number of members	Maximum number of members	Mean average
	No.	No.	No.	No.
Accountancy	35	3	9	4.7
Architecture	31	3	11	5.3
Dentistry	27	3	8	6.0
Engineering	31	3	11	5.9
Law	33	3	16	6.2
Medicine	31	3	16	7.5
Nursing	37	3	15	6.4
Educational Administration	40	3	21	8.0
Totals	265			
Mean Response	33.1			6.0

Qualifications for board membership. In Table XIV the results of nine major qualifications for board membership were tabulated: (1) citizenship, (2) state residence, (3) professional practitioner, (4) lay person, (5) minimum age, (6) not beyond a maximum age, (7) bonding, (8) professional experience, (9) minimum educational requirements.

The data revealed that in all professional groups, 235 boards, or 88.7 per cent of the respondents, required their members to be citizens; 247 boards, or 93.2 per cent, required their members to be state residents; 226 boards, or 85.3 per cent, required their members to be professional practitioners; 29 boards, or 10.9 per cent, required their members to be lay people; 89 boards, or 33.6 per cent, required their members to be a minimum age; 5 boards, or 1.9 per cent, stipulated that members could not be beyond a maximum age; 68 boards, or 25.7 per cent, required that their members be bonded; 152 boards, or 57.4 per cent, required that their professional members have some experience; 152 boards, or 57.4 per cent, required that their members have minimum educational requirements.

It was observed that the percentage of boards in each of the seven comparative professions which required their members to be citizens and state residents ranged between 81.1 per cent in nursing and 100.0 per cent in accountancy, dentistry, and medicine. The percentage of boards in each of the seven groups which required their members to be professional practitioners ranged between 94.3 per cent in accountancy and 100.0 per cent in dentistry, engineering, and medicine.

TABLE XIV

QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED FOR BOARD MEMBERSHIP ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

		The member had to:																																					
Professional Group	Total boards which responded	be a citizen				be a state resident				be a practitioner				be a lay person				be minimum age				be maximum age				be bonded				have some years of professional experience				have minimum educational requirements				have other requirements*	
		Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	Yes	Per cent	No.	Per cent								
Accountancy	35	34	97.1	35	100.0	33	94.3	4	11.4	21	21	60.0	1	60	2.9	5	14.3	13	4	37.1	0	0	21	60.0	11	31.4													
Architecture	31	25	80.6	29	93.5	30	96.8	0	0	16	27	51.6	0	0	0	10	32.3	28	8	90.3	0	0	10	32.3	7	22.6													
Dentistry	27	27	100.0	24	88.9	27	100.0	0	0	9	23	33.3	0	0	0	14	51.8	20	6	74.1	0	0	23	85.2	6	22.2													
Engineering	31	29	93.5	29	93.5	31	100.0	1	3.2	7	34	22.6	0	0	0	7	22.6	31	10	100.0	0	0	10	32.3	16	51.6													
Law	33	29	87.9	28	84.8	32	97.0	0	0	16	21	48.4	1	70	3.0	2	6.1	7	5	21.2	0	0	25	75.8	5	15.2													
Medicine	31	28	90.3	31	100.0	31	100.0	1	3.2	10	21	32.3	1	70	3.2	14	45.1	16	5	51.6	0	0	29	93.5	1	3.2													
Nursing	37	30	81.1	36	97.3	36	97.3	4	10.8	2	21	5.4	1	70	2.7	14	37.8	37	5	100.0	0	0	32	86.5	26	70.3													
Educational Administration	40	33	82.5	35	87.5	6	15.0	19	47.5	8	21	20.0	1	30	2.5	2	5.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.0	7	17.5													
Totals	265	235	88.7	247	93.2	226	85.3	29	10.9	89	5	33.6	1.9	25.7	68	152	0	152	79	29.8																			

* Character and fitness; member of local school advisory council; no professional school affiliations: private or public; no other public office; administrative experience; eminence in the profession

Those boards which required their members to be lay people ranged between 0 per cent in architecture and dentistry, and 11.4 per cent in accountancy. The percentage of boards for each of the seven groups which required their members to be of a minimum age, or not above a maximum age, ranged between a low of 0 per cent for architecture, dentistry, and engineering and a high of 60.0 per cent for accountancy. The mean minimum age ranged between 21 and 34 years; the mean maximum age limit ranged between 60 and 70 years. The percentage of boards which required their members to be bonded ranged between 6.1 per cent for law and 51.8 per cent for dentistry; those boards which required their members to have some professional experience varied between a low of 21.2 per cent for law and a high of 100.0 per cent for engineering and nursing. No boards had educational requirements for lay members; the percentage of boards who required their professional members to have minimum educational requirements ranged between a low of 32.3 per cent in architecture and engineering and a high of 93.5 per cent in medicine.

In the educational administration group it was observed that 33 boards, or 88.7 per cent of the respondents, required their members to be citizens; 35 boards, or 87.5 per cent, required members to be state residents; 6 boards, or 15.0 per cent, required members to be practitioners; 19 boards, or 74.5 per cent, required members to be lay persons; 8 boards, or 20.0 per cent, required members to be of a minimum age; 1 board, or 2.5 per cent, stipulated that members could not be above a maximum age. The mean average minimum age was 21 years, while the maximum mean age was 30 years. In 2 boards, or 5.0 per cent,

members had to be bonded. No members, either lay or professional, were required to have experience or minimum educational requirements.

Methods of attaining board membership. It was established that there were three major methods, or combinations thereof, of obtaining board membership: appointment, election, or ex officio status. In Table XV it was revealed that in 230 boards, or 36.7 per cent of all respondents, membership was attained by means of appointment. There were 18 boards, or 6.8 per cent of the respondents, in which board members were elected. Board members were selected by a combination of the three major methods in 15 boards, or 5.7 per cent of the respondents; a combination of appointment and election was used in 2 boards, or 0.8 per cent of the respondents.

It was observed that the percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions in which members were appointed by the state governors ranged between 87.1 per cent in medicine and 100.0 per cent in architecture, engineering, and nursing. The percentage of boards in which members were elected, ranged between 0 per cent for accountancy, architecture, engineering, and nursing, and 11.1 per cent for dentistry. No boards for each of the seven comparative professions, except accountancy and medicine indicated that their members were selected by a combination of the three major methods; in accountancy and medicine, respectively, 2.9 per cent and 3.2 per cent of the boards indicated that their members were selected by this combination method.

In the educational administration group, it was indicated that board members were appointed in 17 boards, or 42.5 per cent of the

TABLE XV

METHODS BY WHICH MEMBERSHIP WAS ATTAINED ON STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Board members were selected through:										
Professional Group	Total boards which responded	a combination of appointment and election				appointment		election		a combination of appointment, election and ex officio status
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
Accountancy	35	1	2.9	33	94.2	0	0	1	2.9	
Architecture	31	0	0	31	100.0	0	0	0	0	
Dentistry	27	0	0	24	88.9	3	11.1	0	0	
Engineering	31	0	0	31	100.0	0	0	0	0	
Law	33	0	0	30	90.9	3	9.1	0	0	
Medicine	31	0	0	27	87.1	3	9.7	1	3.2	
Nursing	37	0	0	37	100.0	0	0	0	0	
Educational Administration	40	1	2.5	17	42.5	9	22.5	13	32.5	
Totals	265	2		230		18		15		
Per Cent of Total	100		0.8		86.7		6.8		5.7	

respondents. In 9 boards, or 22.5 per cent of the respondents, it was indicated that board members were elected; in 13 boards, or 32.5 per cent of the respondents, it was indicated that board members were selected by a combination of the three major methods; in 1 board, or 2.5 per cent of the respondents, it was indicated that board members were selected by a combination of appointment and election.

Average number of meetings held. Table XVI divided "average number of meetings held," into three categories: (1) meetings required by statute or board by-laws in one year, (2) the number of meetings held between July 1, 1964 and June 30, 1965, and (3) the required number of meetings that a member must attend.

In the seven professional groups, an average of zero to two meetings were required in one year. In contrast, the educational administration group required an average of five meetings per year. The six groups actually held an average of from zero to nine meetings between July 1, 1964 and June 30, 1965; the educational administration group also held an average of nine meetings per year. None of the eight professional groups required that members must attend any meetings.

State support of the boards. The degree of board dependence on support from the state was established in terms of office space, staff and secretarial help allowed the board. Table XVII revealed that slightly more than 50 per cent of all respondents used office space provided by the states; slightly less than 50 per cent employed office staffs and secretaries provided by the states.

TABLE XVI

AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEETINGS HELD BY STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Average number meetings:		
	required in one year	held between July 1, 1964- June 31, 1965	must a member attend in one year
	No.	No.	No.
Accountancy	1	7	0
Architecture	0	0	0
Dentistry	1	5	0
Engineering	2	9	0
Law	2	5	0
Medicine	2	7	0
Nursing	1	8	0
Educational Administration	5	9	0

TABLE XVII

STATE PROVISION FOR OFFICE SPACE AND STAFF FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	States provided for:									
	Total boards which responded	office space		office staff		secretary		other*		
	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
Accountancy	35	14	40.0	12	34.2	11	31.4	6	17.2	
Architecture	31	16	51.6	13	41.9	19	61.3	8	25.8	
Dentistry	27	13	48.1	11	40.8	12	44.4	4	14.8	
Engineering	31	18	58.0	18	58.0	14	45.1	7	22.6	
Law	33	14	42.4	10	30.3	12	36.4	6	18.2	
Medicine	31	18	58.0	14	45.1	14	45.1	6	19.3	
Nursing	37	22	59.5	14	37.8	14	37.8	5	13.5	
Educational Administration	40	26	65.0	23	57.5	30	75.0	3	7.5	
Totals	265	141		115		126		45		
Per Cent Response	100		53.2		43.4		47.5		17.0	

* Retirement plan; use of supreme court staff; statistical staff; exam readers; automobile; legal assistance; clerk; consultant; accounting service; investigators

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions which utilized office space ranged between a low of 40.0 per cent for accountancy to a high of 59.5 per cent for nursing. It was indicated that the percentage of boards which employed office staffs and secretaries ranged between a low of 30.3 per cent for law and a high of 61.3 per cent for architecture.

In the educational administration group 26 boards, or 65.0 per cent of the respondents, utilized office space. There were 23 boards, or 57.5 per cent which employed office staffs and 30 boards, or 75.0 per cent which employed a secretary.

Methods by which boards were financed. A number of categories were established to determine how boards were financed. Fees, dues, state appropriations or combinations of these three methods were the means by which boards were financed.

Table XVIII indicated that 90 boards, or 34.0 per cent of all respondents, were financed by fees; 81 boards, or 30.6 per cent were financed by general state appropriations; and 46 boards, or 17.4 per cent were financed by a combination of fees and dues.

It was indicated that the percentage of boards for the seven comparative professional groups which were financed by fees ranged between a low of 16.1 per cent for engineering and a high of 61.2 per cent for medicine. The percentage of boards which were financed by general state appropriations ranged between 6.1 per cent for law and 32.3 per cent for engineering. Boards which were financed by fees and dues ranged from a low of 9.1 per cent for law and a high of 37.0 per cent for dentistry. The percentage of boards in the seven groups which

TABLE XVIII

METHODS BY WHICH STATE LICENSING BOARDS WERE FINANCED
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total boards which responded	The board was financed by:											
		fees*			members' dues			general state appropriations			fees and dues and appropriations		
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	35	14	40.0	2	5.7	7	20.0	7	20.0	7	20.0	5	14.3
Architecture	31	10	32.3	1	3.2	9	29.0	8	25.8	3	9.7	0	0
Dentistry	27	5	18.5	0	0	7	26.0	10	37.0	5	18.5	0	0
Engineering	31	5	16.1	1	3.2	10	32.3	8	25.8	5	16.1	2	6.5
Law	33	17	51.5	4	12.1	2	6.1	3	9.1	4	12.1	2	6.1
Medicine	31	19	61.2	0	0	5	16.1	4	13.0	3	9.7	0	0
Nursing	37	20	54.1	1	2.7	7	18.9	6	16.2	3	8.1	0	0
Educational Administration	40	0	0	0	0	34	85.0	0	0	1	2.5	0	0
Totals	265	90		9		81		46		29		4	
Per Cent of Total	100		34.0		3.4		30.6		17.4		10.9		1.5
													1.1

* Fees included: examination fees; license fees; registration fees; penalty fees; renewal fees

**Appropriations from the state professional association

were financed by fees and state appropriations ranged between 8.1 per cent for nursing and 18.5 per cent for dentistry.

In contrast, although boards for educational administration collected fees, none were financed by fees alone, or by a combination of fees and dues. There were 34 boards, or 85.0 per cent of the respondents, which were financed by general state appropriations, and 1 board, or 2.5 per cent of the respondents, were financed by a combination of fees and appropriations.

Uses of fees. It was determined that there were six possible general uses of fees. Table XIX revealed that a majority of all respondents used any one of three major methods of using fees. The first method, retaining fees in a fund, was used by 125 boards, or 47.2 per cent of the respondents. The second method employed, turning fees over to the state, was used by 90 boards, or 33.9 per cent of the respondents. The third method, in which the state deposited the fees into a special account for board use, was used by 34 boards, or 12.8 per cent of the respondents. The percentage of boards for the seven comparative professional groups which retained their fees in a fund ranged between a low of 32.3 per cent for engineering and a high of 71.0 per cent for architecture. The percentage of boards which turned their fees over to the state ranged between 15.2 per cent for law and 29.7 per cent for nursing. The percentage of boards whose funds were deposited into a special fund by the state for the boards ranged between a low of 0 per cent for architecture and a high of 35.5 per cent for engineering.

In educational administration, although boards were not financed by fees alone, 3 boards, or 7.5 per cent of the respondents, retained their fees in a fund; 32 boards, or 80.0 per cent of the respondents,

TABLE XIX

USES OF FEES COLLECTED BY STATE LICENSING BOARDS IN EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Fees:*																		
	Total boards which re-sponded	were retained by the board in a fund				were turned over to the state				were deposited into a special fund by the state for the board				were retained by the board for miscellaneous uses		were not levied by board		uses were not stated by the board	
		No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
Accountancy	35	22	62.8	10	28.6	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.7		
Architecture	31	22	71.0	9	29.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Dentistry	27	13	48.2	7	25.9	6	22.2	1	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Engineering	31	10	32.3	9	29.0	11	35.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.2		
Law	33	20	60.6	5	15.2	3	9.1	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12.1		
Medicine	31	15	48.4	7	22.6	8	25.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.2		
Nursing	37	20	54.1	11	29.7	5	13.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.7		
Educational Administration	40	3	7.5	32	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.0	0	0	3	7.5		
Totals	265	125		90		34		2		2		12							
Per Cent of Total	100		47.2		33.9		12.8		0.8		0.8		0.8		0.8		4.5		

* Examination fees; license fees, registration fees; penalty fees; renewal fees

turned their fees over to the state; no boards' funds were deposited into a special fund by the state.

Methods by which members were remunerated. The two most common methods by which board members were remunerated for their services were tabulated in Table XX. Of the two methods used, 147 boards, or 55.5 per cent of all respondents, reimbursed their members for a combination of actual services rendered the board and expenses incurred while on board duty. There were 68 boards, or 25.7 per cent of all respondents, which reimbursed members only for expenses incurred. A third method, reimbursement for actual services was used by 26 boards, or 9.8 per cent of the respondents.

Those boards in the seven comparative professions which reimbursed their members for incurred expenses, ranged between a low of 7.4 per cent for dentistry and a high of 41.9 per cent for architecture for each group. The percentage of boards which reimbursed their members for actual services and incurred expenses ranged between a low of 36.5 for law and a high of 65.7 per cent for accountancy. Those boards which reimbursed their members for actual services ranged between 5.7 per cent for accountancy and 18.5 per cent for dentistry.

There were 13 boards, or 32.5 per cent of the respondents in the educational administration group, reimbursed their members for incurred expenses; 15 boards, or 37.5 per cent, which reimbursed their members for actual services and incurred expenses; 3 boards, or 7.5 per cent, which reimbursed their members for actual services.

TABLE XX

METHODS BY WHICH STATE LICENSING BOARD MEMBERS WERE REMUNERATED IN EIGHT
PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Board members were reimbursed:																
	Total boards which responded	for actual services				for incurred expenses				for actual services and incurred expenses				by other methods*		did not respond	
		No.	No.	Per cent	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	No.	Per cent	No.	No.	Per cent	
Accountancy	35	2	5.7	7	20.0	23	65.7	1	2.9	2	5.7						
Architecture	31	2	6.5	13	41.9	16	51.6	0	0	0	0						
Dentistry	27	5	18.5	2	7.4	17	63.0	1	3.7	2	7.4						
Engineering	31	3	9.7	13	41.9	15	48.4	0	0	0	0						
Law	33	3	9.1	13	39.2	12	36.5	3	9.1	2	6.1						
Medicine	31	4	13.0	4	13.0	20	64.3	3	9.7	0	0						
Nursing	37	4	10.8	3	8.1	29	78.4	1	2.7	0	0						
Educational Administration	40	3	7.5	13	32.5	15	37.5	7	17.5	2	5.0						
Totals	265	26		68		147		16		8							
Per Cent of Total	100		9.8		25.7		55.5		6.0		3.0						

* Annually; semiannually; monthly; biweekly; examination fees; time allowed for grading examinations; appropriations from the state professional association

CHAPTER III

THE CONSTRUCTION AND FINDINGS OF THE INSTRUMENT FOR CURRENT LICENSING PRACTICES OF THE BOARDS

Purpose of This Chapter

The purpose of this chapter was to survey and compare the current licensing practices of state licensing boards for educational administration with seven other professions. A review of the literature revealed a narrow variety of factors by which state licensing boards were reviewed. These factors were compiled, classified, and summarized into a comprehensive set of items by which the current licensing practices of state licensing boards were determined. Further verification of the items was accomplished through the involvement of four persons recognized as authorities in the area of licensure and state licensing boards.

Next, a data collecting instrument was developed. The instrument was sent to the executive secretaries of state licensing boards. The returned data were put onto data collection sheets. These compilations were then tabulated. The rest of the chapter was devoted to the results and the findings of the tabulations dealing with current licensing practices.

Construction of the Instruments

Rationale for items selected. The review of literature indicated that certain specific factors distinctly delineated board composition

and characteristics. Schrammel,¹ Segerist,² Lieberman,³ and others sought to determine what factors were involved in determining a board's licensing procedure. Those factors considered to be pertinent to state board composition and characteristics were presented below.

Schrammel⁴ compared the functions of state boards of education historically. Among the factors of comparison were methods by which licenses were obtained; means used to make appeals for license reinstatement; the life of a license; delegation of the duty of actually issuing licenses.

Segerist⁵ compared the function of medical licensing boards in relation to methods by which licenses were sought; the kinds of requirements imposed upon license candidates were also considered to be important.

Lieberman⁶ reviewed licensing requirements; the kinds of education licenses issued and their longevity. An extensive comparison was made of the licensing requirements in the fifty states.

Lucien Kinney⁷ reviewed steps he felt were requisites for autonomy in education. One necessary step was the establishment of the regulatory

¹Schrammel, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

²Dr. Henry E. Segerist, American Medicine (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1934), pp. 163.

³Lieberman, op. cit., pp. 94-98.

⁴Schrammel, op. cit., pp. 16-22.

⁵Segerist; op. cit., pp. 163-168.

⁶Lieberman, op. cit., p. 95, pp. 128-130.

⁷Lucien B. Kinney, Certification in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 137-139.

licensing board. " . . . This board would be responsible for . . . preparation and licensure of personnel. . . . Professional examinations might or might not be required. . . ." The board was to handle license reciprocity, out of state credentials, and appeals.

Items selected. The items which were derived from the review of literature were placed into one category. There were eight basic items:

1. methods of applying for a license,
2. licensing requirements,
3. procedure used in granting a license,
4. licensing procedures used by licensing boards,
5. methods of license renewal,
6. methods used in licensing reciprocity,
7. methods by which appeals for reinstatement may be made,
8. frequency of appeals.

Clarification of the items. To refine and clarify the basic items, the third category was presented to four persons who were widely experienced with state licensing boards.

1. Mrs. M. Annie Leitch, Director, American Nursing Association Program for State Boards of Nursing.
2. Dr. M. H. Crabb, Secretary, The Federation of State Medical Boards.
3. Mr. E. R. Lock, Director, National Conference of Bar Examiners.
4. Dean L. Gustavson, Chairman, National Council of Architectural Registration Boards.

Each person was asked to criticize and offer suggestions for refinement of the items dealing with current licensing practices.

The items were next presented to the author's dissertation advisor, Dr. M. Chester Nolte, and Dr. Ralph A. Forsythe, the Associate Director of the Bureau of Educational Research, at the University of Denver, for further criticism and suggestions.

As a result of the clarification and suggestions, modifications were made in the items. It was suggested that the category of licensing requirements be expanded to include the various kinds of apprenticeships required in some professions. Required experience was also added.

The instrument. The instrument was designed to consist of eighteen major items with ninety-two subsections. It included items for both characteristics and current licensing practices of state boards. The items and findings for board characteristics were reviewed in Chapter II of this study.

The major licensing practices sought included: (1) methods and requirements imposed upon applicant, (2) legal procedures used by a board in issuing licenses, (3) methods of policing practitioners.

Selection of respondents. The Colorado boards for the eight professions involved in the study were contacted in order to acquire the names and addresses of the executive secretaries and members on the other state licensing boards. After this initial contact, letters were written to 397 board secretaries explaining the purpose of the study. The importance of their cooperation in completing the questionnaires was emphasized.

Organization of the Results of the Survey

Results of the part of the instrument dealing with current licensing practices were reported in the remainder of Chapter III. The data received were placed on data collection sheets. The findings were organized into eight tables which dealt with current licensing practices.

Analysis of the Current Licensing Practices of State Licensing Boards

Methods by which applicants sought licensure. Table XXI was divided into six major areas to determine the methods by which applicants were to obtain licenses. A predominant pattern was revealed: 235 boards, or 88.7 per cent of the respondents, required applicants to complete an application; 209 boards, or 78.9 per cent, required the applicants to complete an application for a specific license. In addition, 223 boards, or 84.2 per cent, required the applicants to file references; 205 boards, or 77.4 per cent of the respondents, required the applicant to take a test. There were 85 boards, or 32.1 per cent of the respondents, which required applicants to attend an oral interview; 65 boards, or 24.5 per cent of the respondents, required applicants to forward a personal letter.

It was indicated that the percentage of boards for the seven comparative professional groups which required applicants to complete an application ranged between 81.1 per cent for nursing and 96.8 per cent for medicine; the percentage of those boards which required applicants to complete applications for a specific license ranged between 65.0 per cent for dentistry and 94.6 per cent for nursing. Except for nursing, those boards which required applicants to file

TABLE XXI

METHODS BY WHICH APPLICATION WAS MADE TO STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR LICENSES
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	The boards required the applicant to:														
	Total boards which responded	attend an oral interview		forward a personal letter		complete an application		complete application for specific license		file references		take a test		other means*	
		No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.
Accountancy	35	3	8.6	3	8.6	32	91.4	27	77.1	33	94.3	32	91.4	4	11.4
Architecture	31	21	67.7	6	19.3	28	90.3	23	74.2	30	96.8	30	96.8	4	12.9
Dentistry	27	10	37.0	8	29.6	24	88.9	17	63.0	22	81.5	23	85.2	3	11.1
Engineering	31	16	51.6	9	29.0	27	87.1	26	83.9	28	90.3	26	83.9	1	3.2
Law	33	12	36.4	7	21.2	31	93.9	26	78.8	31	93.9	29	87.9	2	6.1
Medicine	31	22	71.0	16	51.6	30	96.8	25	80.6	29	93.5	30	96.8	2	6.5
Nursing	37	0	0	11	29.7	30	81.1	35	94.6	22	59.5	31	83.8	0	0
Educational Administration	40	1	2.5	5	12.5	33	82.5	30	75.0	28	70.0	4	10.0	12	30.0
Totals	265	85		65		235		209		223		205		28	
Per Cent of Total			32.1		24.5		88.7		78.9		84.2		77.4		10.6

*Submit sample of work; character examination; reciprocity; record of college transcript; university accreditation and recommendation; and experience.

references ranged between 81.5 per cent in dentistry and 96.0 per cent in architecture; a low of 59.5 per cent of the nursing group required references to be filed. It was indicated that the percentage of boards for the seven professions which required applicants to take a test ranged between 83.8 per cent for nursing and 96.8 per cent for architecture and medicine. The percentage of boards which required the applicants to attend an oral interview ranged between a low of 0 per cent for nursing and a high of 71.0 for medicine; the boards which required applicants to forward a personal letter ranged between a low of 8.6 per cent and a high of 51.6 per cent.

In the educational administration group 33 boards, or 82.5 per cent of the respondents, required applicants to complete an application; 30 boards, or 75.0 per cent, required applicants to complete an application for a specific license. There were 23 boards, or 70.0 per cent of the respondents, which required applicants to file references, and 4 boards, or 10.0 per cent of the respondents, which required applicants to take a test. It was indicated that 1 board, or 2.5 per cent of the respondents, in this group required applicants to attend an oral interview; 5 boards, or 12.5 per cent of the respondents, had to forward a personal letter.

Requirements for licensure. The requirements for licensure were divided into five major areas in Table XXII. A predominant pattern was revealed: 161 boards, or 60.8 per cent of all respondents, required that the applicant take an examination along with graduation and institutional recommendation, experience or internship. It was

TABLE XXII

LICENSING REQUIREMENTS OF STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Total boards which responded	Licenses were obtained by means of:									
		examination alone		examination and a combination of other requirements*		experience and a combination of other requirements**		graduation from an accredited institution		other combinations of experience, education, or recommendation	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	35	2	5.7	26	74.3	1	2.9	0	0	6	17.1
Architecture	31	1	3.2	28	90.4	1	3.2	0	0	1	3.2
Dentistry	27	10	37.0	13	48.2	0	0	2	7.4	2	7.4
Engineering	31	2	6.5	28	90.3	0	0	0	0	1	3.2
Law	33	11	33.3	15	45.5	0	0	3	9.1	4	12.1
Medicine	31	4	12.9	20	64.5	0	0	0	0	7	22.6
Nursing	37	1	2.7	29	78.4	0	0	4	10.8	3	8.1
Educational Administration	40	0	0	2	5.0	17	42.5	16	40.0	5	12.5
Totals	265	31		161		19		25		29	
Per Cent of Total	100		11.7		60.8		7.2		9.4		10.9

* Examination, graduation and institutional recommendation; examination and experience; examination, experience graduation and institutional recommendation; examination and internship

**Experience and employer recommendation; experience, graduation, and institutional recommendation

indicated that 31 boards, or 11.7 per cent of the respondents required examination alone. There were 25 boards, or 9.4 per cent, which required graduation from an accredited institution, and 29 boards, or 10.9 per cent, required various combinations of experience, education, or recommendation. Those boards which required experience and a combination of either employer recommendation, or graduation and institutional recommendation amounted to 19, or 7.2 per cent of the respondents.

It was indicated that the boards for the seven comparative professions which required examination and a combination of graduation and institutional recommendation, experience, or internship, ranged between a low of 45.5 per cent for law and a high of 90.4 per cent for architecture. Those boards for the seven groups which required examination alone ranged between a low of 2.7 per cent for nursing and a high of 37.0 per cent for dentistry. None of the seven comparative groups, except accountancy and architecture, required experience and a combination of employer recommendation, or graduation and institutional recommendation; 2.9 per cent and 3.2 per cent of the boards for accountancy and architecture, respectively, required experience and the combination. None of the seven comparative groups, except dentistry, law, and nursing required graduation from an accredited institution; 7.4 per cent, 9.1 per cent and 10.8 per cent of the boards for dentistry, law, and nursing required graduation.

In the educational administration group, no boards required examination alone, 2 boards, or 5.0 per cent, required examination, institutional recommendation, experience or internship. It was indicated

that 17 boards, or 42.5 per cent, required experience, employer recommendation, or graduation or institutional recommendation, while 16 boards, or 40.0 per cent, required graduation from an accredited institution.

Procedures used in granting licenses. Table XXIII revealed that three procedures were used in granting licenses: (1) the discretionary method, (2) the ministerial method, (3) a combination of both. The boards for all professional groups were divided between using both methods; a little less than half, 122 boards, or 46.0 per cent, used the ministerial approach, while 110 boards, or 41.6 per cent, used the discretionary approach. There were 29 boards, or 10.9 per cent, which used both the discretionary and the ministerial methods.

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions which used the ministerial approach ranged between a low of 25.8 per cent for medicine and a high of 62.2 per cent for nursing. Similarly, the boards which used the discretionary method ranged between a low of 18.9 per cent for nursing and a high of 58.0 per cent for architecture and engineering.

In contrast, 28 boards, or 70.0 per cent of the educational administration group, used the ministerial approach; licenses were issued when a prearranged set of standards were met. There were 8 boards, or 20.0 per cent, which used a combination of the two methods, and 4 boards, or 10.0 per cent, which used the discretionary method.

Where issuance of licenses was discretionary, 147 boards, or 55.5 per cent of all respondents, made the decisions. There were 36

TABLE XXIII

PROCEDURES BY WHICH STATE LICENSING BOARDS GRANTED LICENSES
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	The granting of a license was:										If discretionary, the decision was made by the:							
	Total boards which re-sponded	discre-tionary and minis-terial				discre-tionary minis-terial				other		Total boards which re-sponded	board state supreme court other* boards which did not respond					
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		
Accountancy	35	2	5.7	12	34.2	20	57.2	1	2.9	35	21	60.1	0	0	2	5.7	12	34.2
Architecture	31	2	6.5	18	58.0	10	32.3	1	3.2	31	18	58.0	0	0	1	3.2	12	38.7
Dentistry	27	1	3.7	14	51.8	11	40.8	1	3.7	27	17	63.0	0	0	0	0	10	37.0
Engineering	31	2	6.5	18	58.0	11	35.5	0	0	31	26	83.9	0	0	0	0	5	16.1
Law	33	3	9.1	18	54.6	11	33.3	1	3.0	33	5	15.2	16	48.4	6	18.2	6	18.2
Medicine	31	4	13.0	19	61.2	8	25.8	0	0	31	25	80.5	0	0	2	6.5	4	13.0
Nursing	37	7	18.9	7	18.9	23	62.2	0	0	37	29	78.4	0	0	2	5.4	6	16.2
Educational Administration	40	8	20.0	4	10.0	28	70.0	0	0	40	6	15.0	0	0	23	57.5	11	27.5
Totals	265	29	110	122	4	1.5	265	147	16	36	66	6.0	13.6	24.9				
Per Cent of Total	100		10.9	41.6	46.0	1.5	100	55.5										

* Division of professional licensing services; state departments of education; department of health; department of law enforcement; state department of certification and public standards

boards, or 13.6 per cent of all respondents, in which the decisions for granting licenses were made by either the division of professional licensing services, state department of education, department of health, department of law enforcement, or the state department of certification and public standards.

It was observed that the percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions, except for the law group which made the decisions for granting licenses ranged between a low of 60.1 per cent for accountancy and a high of 83.9 per cent for engineering. Although 5 boards, or 15.2 per cent, in the law group made licensing decisions, in 16 boards, or 48.4 per cent of the group, the decisions were made by the state supreme courts; in 6 other law boards, or 18.2 per cent, the decisions were made by departments of law enforcement, or state departments of education.

There were 6 boards, or 15.0 per cent of the respondents in educational administration, which made decisions concerning the issuance of licenses. It was indicated that in 23 boards, or 57.5 per cent of the respondents, licensing decisions were made by a section within the state department of education, or the state department of certification and public standards.

Licensing procedures of the boards. It was determined in Table XXIV that the actual issuance of a license was a delegated duty. Three categories were established in the table: a person, another state board, another state department. In the totals for all professional groups, it was revealed that 120 boards, or a little less than half, 45.3 per cent, delegated the task to an individual. Most

TABLE XXIV

LICENSING PROCEDURES OF STATE LICENSING BOARDS FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	License issuance was delegated to:										Duration of license was for:																															
	Total boards which re-sponded	a person*					another state department					boards which did not respond					Total boards which re-sponded	life					a specified period**					life with annual renewal					other					boards which did not respond				
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.		Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent										
Accountancy	35	11	31.4	1	2.9	2	5.7	21	60.0	35	12	34.2	15	42.9	8	22.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
Architecture	31	18	58.1	0	0	0	0	13	41.9	31	2	6.5	25	80.5	4	13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
Dentistry	27	14	51.9	1	3.7	4	14.8	8	29.6	27	7	25.9	9	33.3	11	40.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
Engineering	31	9	29.0	0	0	1	3.2	21	67.8	31	4	13.0	18	58.0	8	25.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	1	3.2	3.2											
Law	33	3	9.1	0	0	24	72.7	6	18.2	33	30	90.9	0	0	0	0	2	6.1	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	3.0											
Medicine	31	16	51.6	1	3.2	3	9.7	11	35.5	31	19	61.2	7	22.6	4	13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	1	3.2	3.2											
Nursing	37	33	89.2	0	0	3	8.1	1	2.7	37	4	10.8	23	62.2	7	18.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8.1	3	8.1	8.1											
Educational Administration	40	16	40.0	1	2.5	19	47.5	4	10.0	40	6	15.0	25	62.5	6	15.0	1	2.5	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	5.0											
Totals	265	120	45.3	4	1.5	56	21.1	85	32.1	265	84	31.7	122	46.0	48	18.2	3	1.1	8	3.0	8	3.0	8	3.0	8	3.0	8	3.0	8	3.0	3.0											
Per Cent of Total	100																																									

* Board chairman; secretary; executive secretary; state superintendent of public instruction; director department of regulation

**1-3 years; 1-5 years; 1-10 years; annually; biennially

were board secretaries hired for the purpose, state superintendents of public instruction or directors of the departments of regulation.

There were 56 boards, or 21.1 per cent of all respondents, in which the actual issuance of licenses was delegated to another state department.

It was indicated that the percentage of the boards for the seven comparative professions, except for the law group, which delegated the issuance of licenses to a person ranged between a low of 29.0 per cent for engineering and a high of 89.2 per cent for nursing. There were 3 boards, or 9.1 per cent of the respondents for the law group, which delegated the issuance of licenses to a person. These boards for the seven professions, except for the law group, in which the issuance of licenses was delegated to another department ranged between 0 per cent for architecture and 14.8 per cent for dentistry. There were 24 boards, or 72.7 per cent of the respondents for the law group, in which the issuance of licenses was delegated to another state department.

In the educational administration group, 16 boards, or 40.0 per cent of the respondents, delegated issuance of licenses to a person, while, in 19 boards, or 47.5 per cent of the respondents, the issuance of licenses was delegated to another state department.

There were 85 boards, or 32.1 per cent of the total respondents, which did not answer this question.

The duration of licensure was divided into life, a specified period, life with annual renewal. The specified periods ranged from one to three years, to one to ten years. A little less than one-half, 122 boards, or 46.0 per cent, of all professional groups issued licenses

for a specified period. There were 84 boards, or 31.7 per cent of all respondents, which issued licenses for life, and 48 boards, or 18.2 per cent, which issued licenses for life with annual renewal.

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative groups which issued licenses for a specified period of time, except for the law group, ranged between a low of 22.6 per cent for medicine and a high of 80.5 per cent for architecture. It was indicated that the percentage of boards which issued licenses for life varied from a low of 6.5 per cent for architecture to a high of 61.2 per cent for medicine. There were 30 boards, or 90.9 per cent, of the law group which issued licenses for life, but none of its boards issued licenses for a specified period. The percentage of those boards in the seven groups which issued licenses for life with annual renewal ranged between a low of 0 per cent for the law group and a high of 40.8 per cent for the dentistry group.

In the educational administration group 25 boards, or 62.5 per cent of the respondents, issued licenses for a specified period. There were 6 boards, or 15.0 per cent, which issued licenses for life, and 15 per cent which issued licenses for life with annual renewal.

Methods of license renewal. It was shown in Table XXV that a majority of the respondents, 167 boards, or 63.0 per cent, renewed licenses if licensees reapplied. A comparison of "duration of license," in Table XXIV showed that 46.0 per cent of the boards issued licenses for a specified period; the periods were one to three, one to five, and one to ten years in duration. There were 29 boards, or 10.9 per cent of all respondents, which required the applicant

TABLE XXV

METHODS OF LICENSE RENEWAL REQUIRED BY STATE LICENSING BOARDS
FOR EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	A license was renewed upon:																	
	Total boards which re-sponded	meeting further educational requirements			reapplication			experience			renewal was not necessary			other*			did not respond to question	
		No.	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Accountancy	35	0	0	28	80.0	0	0	4	11.4	0	0	3	8.6					
Architecture	31	0	0	30	96.8	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	0	0					
Dentistry	27	0	0	25	92.6	0	0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0					
Engineering	31	0	0	24	77.5	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	6	19.3					
Law	33	0	0	0	0	1	3.0	12	36.4	9	27.3	11	33.3					
Medicine	31	0	0	24	77.5	0	0	0	0	6	19.3	1	3.2					
Nursing	37	0	0	34	91.9	0	0	0	0	3	8.1	0	0					
Educational Administration	40	29	72.5	2	5.0	2	5.0	1	2.5	3	7.5	3	7.5					
Totals	265	29	167	3	18	24	24											
Per Cent of Total	100	10.9	63.0	1.1	6.8	9.1	9.1											

* Subject to payment of annual fees

to meet further educational requirements; 24 boards, or 9.1 per cent of the respondents, renewed licenses when annual fees were paid.

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions, except for the law group, which renewed licenses when licensees reapplied ranged between a low of 77.5 per cent for engineering and medicine and a high of 96.8 for architecture. There were 36.4 per cent of the boards in the law group which did not require license renewal. The boards which required annual payment of fees before licenses could be renewed ranged between 0 per cent for accountancy and 27.3 per cent for law.

There were 29 boards, or 72.5 per cent of the respondents for the educational administration group, which stipulated that licensees meet further educational requirements for license renewal. It was required that the licensee reapply in 5.0 per cent of the cases, the licensee have experience in another 5.0 per cent of the cases, and the licensee pay annual fees in another 7.5 per cent of the cases.

Licensing reciprocity. It was established in Table XXVI that 195 boards, or 73.6 per cent of all respondents, practiced license reciprocity. There were 50 boards, or 18.9 per cent of the respondents, which did not practice license reciprocity.

The percentage of boards which did practice license reciprocity for the seven comparative professions ranged between a low of 33.3 per cent for dentistry and a high of 97.1 per cent for accountancy. Those boards which did not practice license reciprocity ranged between a low of 2.9 for accountancy and a high of 63.0 per cent for dentistry.

In the educational administration group, 17 boards, or 42.5 per cent, practiced license reciprocity, while, 14 boards, or 35.0 per

TABLE XXVI
PERCENTAGE OF LICENSING BOARDS WHICH MAINTAINED LICENSING RECIPROCITY
IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Was licensing reciprocity carried on with other states?						Was limited practice licensing reciprocity carried on with other states?								
	Total boards which re-sponded	Yes			No			Total boards which re-sponded	Yes			No			Did not respond to question
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
Accountancy	35	34	97.1	1	2.9	0	0	35	1	2.9	14	40.0	20	57.1	
Architecture	31	27	87.0	2	6.5	2	6.5	31	1	3.2	15	48.4	15	48.4	
Dentistry	27	9	33.3	17	63.0	1	3.7	27	2	7.4	8	29.6	17	63.0	
Engineering	31	27	87.1	1	3.2	3	9.7	31	4	13.0	9	29.0	18	58.0	
Law	33	19	57.6	10	30.3	4	12.1	33	6	18.2	9	27.3	18	54.5	
Medicine	31	28	90.3	3	9.7	0	0	31	2	6.5	15	48.4	14	45.1	
Nursing	37	34	91.9	2	5.4	1	2.7	37	1	2.7	2	5.4	34	91.9	
Educational Administration	40	17	42.5	14	35.0	9	22.5	40	2	5.0	1	2.5	34	92.5	
Totals	265	195		50		20		265	19		73		173		
Per Cent of Total.	100		73.6		18.9		7.5	100		7.2		27.5		65.3	

cent did not. There were 9 boards, or 22.5 per cent, which did not respond.

In some states, limited practice reciprocity was allowed. But in all professions which responded, only a negligible number allowed it; 173 boards, or 65.3 per cent of all respondents, did not answer the question.

It was indicated that 73 boards, or 27.5 per cent of all respondents, did not practice limited licensing reciprocity.

In the seven comparative professions, it was observed that the percentage of boards which did not practice limited reciprocity ranged between a low of 5.4 per cent for nursing and a high of 48.4 per cent for architecture and medicine. Those boards which did not answer the question ranged between a low of 45.1 per cent for medicine and a high of 91.9 per cent for nursing.

In the educational administration group 34 boards, or 92.5 per cent of the respondents, did not answer the question; 2.5 per cent indicated that they did not practice limited reciprocity while 5.0 per cent did.

Appeals and to whom they were made. If an applicant was refused a license, or a licensee was refused license renewal, there was usually some means by which an impartial adjudication could be made. Table XXVII revealed that 209 boards, or 78.9 per cent of the respondents, allowed appeals to be made, while 23 boards or 8.7 per cent, did not allow appeals.

TABLE XXVII

DISTRIBUTION OF APPEALS, AND THE BODIES TO WHICH APPEALS WERE MADE
IN CASES OF LICENSE REFUSAL OR REVOCATION IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS
IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	If applicant was refused a license, was an appeal possible?						An appeal was made to:											
	Total boards which re-sponded	yes			no			Total boards which re-sponded	the board		the courts		the attorney general		other*	did not respond to question		
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent				
Accountancy	35	25	71.4	4	11.4	6	17.2	35	16	45.7	7	20.0	0	0	2	5.7	10	28.6
Architecture	31	28	90.3	3	9.7	0	0	31	10	32.2	11	35.5	2	6.5	5	16.1	3	9.7
Dentistry	27	16	59.3	4	14.8	7	25.9	27	6	22.2	8	29.6	0	0	2	7.4	11	40.8
Engineering	31	27	87.1	1	3.2	3	9.7	31	14	45.1	9	29.0	0	0	4	12.9	4	13.0
Law	33	23	69.6	5	15.2	5	15.2	33	2	6.1	20	60.6	0	0	0	0	11	33.3
Medicine	31	29	93.5	0	0	2	6.5	31	6	19.4	17	54.7	0	0	6	19.4	2	6.5
Nursing	37	36	97.3	0	0	1	2.7	37	28	75.7	6	16.2	0	0	2	5.4	1	2.7
Educational Administration	40	25	62.5	6	15.0	9	22.5	40	17	42.5	0	0	0	0	10	25.0	13	32.5
Totals	265	209		23		33		265	99		78		2		31		55	
Per Cent of Total	100		78.9		8.7		12.5	100		37.4		29.4		0.8		11.7		20.8

* Commissioners; Governor; Commissioner of Health; administrative hearing officers; state superintendent of public instruction

TABLE XXVIII

FREQUENCY OF APPEALS FOR REVIEW OF LICENSES WHICH WERE
REFUSED OR REVOKED IN EIGHT PROFESSIONS
IN THE FIFTY STATES FOR 1966

Professional Group	Frequency of appeals					
	Total boards which re- sponded	1-10 per cent of all cases				
		none	infre- quent	extremely rare	no response	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Accountancy	35	12	8	1	1	13
Architecture	31	11	13	3	0	4
Dentistry	27	7	5	4	1	10
Engineering	31	6	11	6	1	7
Law	33	3	7	9	3	11
Medicine	31	10	9	7	1	4
Nursing	37	13	10	7	2	5
Educational Administration	40	0	18	13	1	8
Totals	265	62	81	50	10	62
Mean Response	33.1	7.8	10.1	6.3	1.3	7.8

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions which allowed appeals ranged from a low of 59.3 per cent in dentistry to a high of 97.3 per cent in nursing.

There were 25 boards, or 62.5 per cent of the respondents in educational administration, which allowed appeals, while 6 boards, or 15.0 per cent, did not.

When the appeal was made, it was referred, initially, to either the board, the state courts, or the state attorney general. None of the three methods were used predominantly: 37.4 per cent of all respondents referred appeals to the board, 29.4 per cent referred appeals to the state courts, while 0.8 per cent referred them to the state attorney general. There were 55 boards, or 20.8 per cent which did not respond.

The percentage of boards in the seven comparative professions, except for the nursing group, which heard appeals ranged between a low of 6.1 per cent for law and a high of 45.7 per cent for engineering; 75.7 per cent of the boards for nursing heard appeals. Those boards which indicated that the courts heard appeals ranged between a low of 16.2 per cent for nursing to a high of 60.4 per cent for law. No boards except 2.5 per cent in architecture referred appeals to the attorney general. It was indicated that those boards which referred appeals to the governor, the commissioner of health, or the state superintendent of instruction ranged between 0 per cent for law and 19.4 per cent for medicine.

There were 17 boards, or 42.5 per cent of the respondents in educational administration, which heard appeals. No boards referred

appeals to the courts or the attorney general; 10 boards, or 25.0 per cent referred appeals to the state superintendent of public instruction.

Frequency of appeals. In Table XXVIII, the frequency of appeals was shown. It was observed that from the types of words used by respondents that appeals for license renewal or license refusal, were not many. A mean average response of 6.3 to 10.1 boards per professional group used words such as "infrequent," "none," or "extremely rare." There were 1.3 boards per professional group reported that appeals were made in 1-10 per cent of all cases reported; 7.8 boards per professional group did not respond to the question.

In the educational administration group, 18 boards reported that appeals were infrequent; 13 reported that they were extremely rare, while 1 board reported that 1-10 per cent of the cases were appealed. The only predominant term used by all respondents and the educational administration group was the word "infrequent."

CHAPTER IV

Summary and Interpretations

Purpose of This Chapter

The purpose of this chapter was to report the conclusions and interpretations of this study for the composition, characteristics, and licensing practices of state licensing boards.

Licensing Board Composition

1. It was apparent that there was a greater tendency on the part of the members of the seven comparative professions to return the instruments dealing with board composition. These professional practitioners indicated a stronger interest in this study than did the lay people on the boards of educational administration.

The reverse situation was true for the board secretaries. There was a greater tendency on the part of the board secretaries for the educational administration group to return the instruments dealing with board characteristics and licensing practices. These salaried employees, usually paid from state appropriations, indicated a stronger interest in this study than did the other secretaries who were usually paid from board funds.

2. It was evident that in the comparative professions, except for the law group, the trend in member selection was toward a special type of gubernatorial appointment. Many board candidates were selected by an electorate made up of members of the profession. A list of names was then presented to the state governor from which he chose the new

board members. It was apparent that the law group members were selected either by the state supreme courts or the state bar commissions. Most likely, because the seven comparative professions could present lists of practitioner-candidates to the governor, they were delegated control of state licensing board practices and entrance into and expulsion from their professions.

This trend and the type of gubernatorial appointment was not in evidence for the school administration group.

3. Although the boards for the seven comparative professions did not seem to discriminate against male or female membership, their board members, except nursing, were drawn from professional populations which were mainly male. Apparently, the nursing group board members were predominantly female because they were drawn from a professional population which was mainly female. The educational administration board members were lay members who were usually chosen at the pleasure of the governor, regardless of sex.

4. The boards for all professional groups were composed of relatively older people, which was indicated by the fact that a great majority of members were between the ages of thirty-six and sixty-five. It seemed logical that because professional people completed their training in their late twenties or early thirties, and the boards required their members to have some professional experience, that boards necessarily be composed of older people.

All boards imposed minimum age limitations and relatively few boards in accountancy, law, medicine, nursing, and educational administration set up maximum age limits. It was likely that the minimum age

limits were established to prevent minors from taking office, and to ensure that professional society requirements were met.

5. The fact that a majority of members served on the boards from two to ten years apparently indicated that the boards were not static in terms of the holding power of the members. It seemed to indicate further that specific individuals were prevented from monopolizing board membership; it appeared that self-succession on the boards was not the general rule.

The seven comparative professions could easily control the actions of their board representatives; the state professional societies usually recommended a list of names from which the governor would select new board members. It seemed apparent that if the current board members did not meet the wishes of the professional electorate body, their names would not be considered for re-election.

Although a majority of the board members in the educational administration group were appointed by the state governors, approximately one-fourth of the members were elected by the people or representatives of the people.

6. The board members for the seven comparative professions were experienced practitioners of the professions which they licensed. However, it seemed that the professional electorate bodies which recommended board candidates to the governors preferred practitioners who had experience. It was apparent that, as members of the professional groups which they licensed, they were obliged to keep abreast of current changes and innovations in their professional areas; licensure of candidates demanded

that board members have a broad knowledge of professional methodology, practices, and procedures.

The boards for educational administration were composed of lay people and professional people from areas other than education. These boards were usually responsible for executing the legislative enactments dealing with education. It was apparent that such matters as licensure were delegated to the state superintendent of education, a section or a department within the state department of education. In effect, although these boards delegated the licensing function, they established a prearranged set of standards which determined whether or not a candidate was eligible for a license. Nevertheless, because of a lay membership on the boards, the educational administration profession had no control of entry into and expulsion from its ranks as did the other seven professions.

7. It was concluded that a large majority of the board members for all professions were college graduates; it depended upon the professional group whether or not a graduate degree was necessary for practice. However, while the older professions, such as dentistry, law, and medicine did usually require pre-professional and graduate training in these areas, the newer ones, such as accountancy, architecture and engineering obliged their members to have lengthy experiential backgrounds instead. Nevertheless, a predominance of members in the newer professions held degrees in their professional areas. It was probable that the state professional societies along with the national professional societies usually established licensure requirements. Therefore, board members had to be professional practitioners, licensed by their own profession.

Although a little more than half of the members in the educational administration groups held graduate degrees, a negligible number held them in the area of school administration. Degrees and lay educated members notwithstanding, this group lacked practitioner representation and, therefore, could not establish professional requirements for entrance into its ranks.

By requiring board candidates to possess professional degrees and to have experiential backgrounds, these comparative groups were ensuring their autonomy, and control of professional standards. Although the professional associations and practitioners made recommendations, licensing standards were established by the lay boards of educational administration.

Licensing Board Characteristics

1. It was apparent that the seven comparative professions were given professional autonomy and control of their ranks by state sanction. As a result of this professional autonomy, the state licensing boards were delegated the right to act as independent bodies empowered to issue licenses. Apparently, these boards acted for and with the consent of the professional groups.

Although the boards of educational administration were autonomous, independent bodies empowered to issue licenses, they were not composed of professional practitioners. Instead, the members of these boards were predominantly lay people. It was likely that the lay, and other (professional) board members in educational administration were qualified to establish licensing standards, and to issue licenses. The board members were empowered to establish licensing standards for the

professional practitioners, even though the members were primarily lay people.

2. Except for law, nursing, and educational administration, the boards for all the other professional groups did not adhere to any one code established by the boards, or the national association more strongly than the other. The nursing and educational administration groups adhered to codes established by the national professional associations, while the law group adhered to the codes established jointly by the state professional societies and the state supreme courts.

It was probable that the codes of ethics which were established by the boards for the practitioners were based upon, or similar to, the national codes. In conclusion, it was apparent that the definition of the professional standards and conduct of the practitioners were closely controlled by the professional associations through either the boards or the national association. Therefore, professional control of the group was maintained through enforcement of a similar code at the state or national level.

Although a majority of the educational administration boards adhered to a code of ethics established on the national level, there was no indication that there was one code developed by one national association. Nevertheless, it seemed obvious that control of the practitioner was maintained through enforcement of these national codes.

3. The boards for all professional groups exhibited no consistency in the number of members. Although the maximum number of members on the boards in each professional group varied from eight to sixteen, no board had less than three members. This minimum number of board

members seemed to indicate an interest in economy rather than board functionality. Of course, it would seem that the larger boards were an attempt to ensure the adequate representation of all factions and schools in a particular profession. Yet, no professional group indicated that there was an established policy or set of guidelines which determined the number of members that a board might have.

Boards of educational administration, which were primarily composed of lay people, had more than adequate representation in terms of size. The implication was that the boards represented the popular electorate and/or the governor and, for them, established educational administration policies and controlled educational administration. The educational administration practitioners, appeared to have little, if anything, to do with the control of board functions.

4. Candidates for board membership had to be United States citizens and residents of the states in which they were to serve. There the similarity between the seven comparative professions and educational administration ended. The qualifications for the comparative group board members went beyond citizenship and residence requirements: the candidate usually had three to ten years of professional practice, a professional license, graduation from an approved professional school, and possession of moral character. Persons who were associated with the administration or staff of professional schools were disqualified from board candidacy. It was apparent that the seven comparative professions, through statutory decree, ensured their professional autonomy by requiring candidates for board membership to be practitioners of the profession.

Autonomy for the educational administration boards was evidenced, although the boards were not composed of professional practitioners. In fact, almost one-half the boards required their members to be lay people. It was probable that the states were concerned with public control of education and, as a result, prevented the state boards of education from being controlled by any one special group.

5. Board members for the seven comparative professions were selected primarily through gubernatorial appointment, rather than by any other method. In addition to the elaborate qualifications of citizenry, residence, experience and education, the professional groups further ensured professional autonomy through method of candidate selection. It was apparent that governors were legally bound to select appointees from a list of candidates selected by a professional society. Where there were no statutory restrictions where the professional groups could make the nominations, it was probable that the governors would consult with representatives of the professional societies before acting.

In most of the states, appointment of board members was established either by statutory decree, or constitutional provision. However, in keeping with the democratic nature of education in the fifty states, educational administration board members were either elected by the people or appointed by the state governor. Many states placed ex officio officers who were not professional practitioners onto these educational administration boards. It is most likely that educational administration board members will not be practitioners, but rather, lay people or practitioners of other professions.

6. The boards for all professional groups considered their members to be professional enough not to be required to attend any meetings. Although the boards, except for architecture, required that a minimum number of meetings be held each year, all board members exhibited a professional attitude by attending more meetings than were required. It was probable, too, that the amount of board business was heavy enough so that the members were forced to schedule more meetings than the established minimum.

7. It was apparent that the state boards for the seven comparative groups did not seek state provision of office space, staff or secretaries. Only a slight majority of boards in architecture, engineering, medicine and nursing were given office space, while less than a majority of all boards for each group, except engineering, accepted office staffs and secretaries provided for by the state.

In keeping with the status of public education it is most likely that a large majority of the boards for educational administration depend upon the state for office space, staff and secretaries.

It was evident that professional autonomy and integrity was being maintained and extended by the boards for the seven groups. Professional autonomy might be compromised if the state was sought for board support. It was most likely that this was not true of the educational administration boards. These boards which were established by and represented the people of the state, would logically seek state support of their staffs, secretaries and office space.

8. In keeping with the professional independence established in the areas of office space, staff and secretaries, a majority of the

boards for the seven comparative professions were financed by either fees alone, or a combination of fees and dues. It was probably held that professional licensing boards should be self-sustaining rather than be a problem to the taxpayers. Although a small minority of boards were financed by general state appropriations, another minority group was financed by a combination of fees and appropriations; again, professional groups attempted to maintain their autonomy and professional integrity by limiting their dependence upon state funds.

Nevertheless, the educational administration group's dependence upon general state appropriations was consonant with the public nature of the boards. It is most likely that educational administration boards shall depend upon general state appropriations, rather than depend upon the professional practitioners for financial assistance.

It was indicated that a majority of the boards for the seven professions which collected fees either retained their fees or turned them over to the state for deposit into a fund for board use. The latter method appeared to be a legal, state required accounting of fees collected by quasi-governmental bodies such as licensing boards. It was apparent that professional autonomy was being extended by the boards' maintaining effective control over their finances and financial status.

Apparently, states did exercise control over board financial affairs through auditing and accounting procedures. These practices were usually procedural rather than restrictions limiting board independence. To meet state requirements or criticism many boards bonded those members who handled board funds.

It was indicated for the boards in the educational administration group that a predominant number turned their fees over to the state. It might be deduced from this procedure, and the fact that these boards were supported by state appropriations, that educational administration was controlled by the public rather than the professional practitioners. Through the lay representatives on the state boards, the public determined professional requirements, licensing practices, and also controlled board financial policy.

There was a definite trend for a majority of the boards for the seven professions, except engineering and law, to reimburse their members for actual services and incurred expenses, while other boards reimbursed members only for incurred expenses. It was apparent that the professional groups were reimbursing their members for time taken away from their practices and the expenses incurred during this time. It would not be equitable to place board members on a full-time method of reimbursement, or a full-time salary, because, it is likely that they work for the boards on a part-time basis.

Licensing Board Practices

1. A large majority of the boards for all professional groups initially required the license candidates to complete applications for specific licenses, and file references. In addition, a predominance of the boards for the seven comparative professional groups required the candidates to take a test. No pattern was indicated which required the candidates to attend oral interviews or forward personal letters.

Apparently, on the one hand, the educational administration group does not consider the test criterion to be of importance or an adequate

indicator in determining who should or should not receive a license. On the other hand, it seemed that the seven comparative groups did consider the test criterion important in maintaining standards or raising standards of entry into the professions.

It was indicated further that a large majority of the boards for the seven comparative groups, except for law and dentistry, required the license applicants to be graduates of approved professional institutions, have institutional recommendation, some experience or internship, or a varying combination of these. The dentistry and law groups were divided between the above requirements and examinations alone. Obviously, the professional groups maintained high standards of professional excellence by controlling the type of preparation institutions which they would recognize, and the entrance requirements of the licensing candidates. More than one criterion was used to judge the ability of a candidate.

A large majority of the boards for educational administration required the license candidate to either have experience and a combination of employer recommendation, graduation, and institutional recommendation or only graduation from an accredited institution. It would seem that the first requirement, experience, presupposes that candidates should acquire previous experience at a lower level, such as teaching. The second, or alternate requirement, graduation from an accredited institution, most likely places some of the burden of adequate preparation upon the preparatory institution. Apparently, compared to the other professional groups, educational administration boards use different criteria to determine which candidates should or should not

receive a license. In addition, there were a number of specific kinds of educational administration licenses which were available: for example, school superintendent's license, high school principal's license, elementary school principal's license, assistant principal's license. Most likely, boards for educational administration deem it necessary to differentiate among licensing these sub-groups within the educational administration profession. It seems to imply that special training and preparation for each of these sub-groups are necessary in order for the practitioners to meet the individual needs apparent in each situation.

2. The boards for the seven comparative groups were divided as to whether or not their right to issue licenses should be ministerial or discretionary. A small majority of boards in each of five groups used the discretionary method in issuing licenses while a small majority of boards in each of two groups adhered to the ministerial method. It was apparent that those groups which used the discretionary method were able to consider the disposition of each license applicant's case on its own merits and individual differences. Hence, the five professional groups were given state sanction to allow the board to handle entrance requirements for the professions as they saw fit. Obviously, board members were allowed to adjust standards, within an acceptable range, and take into consideration any and all circumstances for each and every candidate: professional autonomy was more apparent in these five groups than in any other.

The two groups which used the ministerial method had to judge license candidates in terms of a prearranged set of standards, and no

variation was allowed. This seemed to indicate that either the state professional society, state statutory limitations, or both, imposed standards to which the boards were bound to adhere. It was probable that the licensing functions of these boards were reduced to a routine basis,

Where discretion was allowed in the seven comparative groups, except for law, the board was usually the body which made the decision to issue licenses. Decision making in the law group was divided among either the board, the state supreme court, or the department of certification and public standards. Evidently, professional autonomy was further enhanced by allowing state professional boards to use discretion in making the final decision in licensure after all factors were weighed and considered. Although the state supreme courts usually made the decisions to issue licenses, it was done upon strong board recommendation. Further the members of the supreme court were practitioners of the legal profession, hence, decision making was not delegated to a group outside the profession.

In the educational administration group, a majority of the boards delegated licensing decisions to sections within the state departments of education, a division of professional licensing services, or a state department of certification and public standards. Evidently, these boards, established standards of licensure, and then delegated the responsibility for decisions based upon these prearranged set of standards to an arm of the state department of education under its jurisdiction. In essence, then, many of the educational administration boards had to grant licenses if the candidate met a prearranged set of

standards, although the set of standards was not established by the professional association.

3. The actual issuance of licenses for all professions was a delegated duty. A little less than one-half of all boards, except for the law group, delegated this duty to a person, such as the secretary, executive secretary, the chairman, or the state superintendent of instruction. The law group made recommendations to the state supreme court which was responsible for issuing the licenses. It seemed superfluous that the time of the board members should be taken up in this mechanical, routine job.

The boards of educational administration were almost equally divided between using a person on the board or delegating the duty to a section in the state department of education. Again, it was not necessary to take up the time of board members in this routine job.

4. There was no pattern which seemed to develop among the seven comparative groups as to the duration of a license. Licenses were issued for stated periods, for life, for life with annual renewal. While the majority of boards in three professional groups issued licenses for a specified period, a majority of boards in two other professions issued licenses for life. Nevertheless, the professional groups had to finance their board activities, and usually charge a renewal fee on licenses. Professional autonomy was evidenced by the fact that boards, with the approval of the professional group, could levy fees, dues or both, on the membership, or the license candidate, as they saw fit.

Licenses were renewed upon reapplication in a large majority of the boards in the seven comparative groups except for law. The law group was divided between not requiring license renewal, and charging an annual fee. It was apparent that the profession members would not have to be forced to keep up with current changes in their fields; rather, in order to remain effective practitioners, the members would, of their own volition, keep abreast of professional advancements in techniques, methodology and research. The reapplication seemed to serve the needs of: (1) keeping the professional group aware of the practitioner's status, (2) keeping the professional group in control of all practitioners, (3) keeping professional ethics and autonomy alive,

In contrast, a large majority of the boards for the educational administration group, required the candidate for license renewal to meet further educational requirements with each renewal. Most likely the boards felt that it was necessary for the practitioner to keep abreast of changes in his profession through further education. In fact it was further implied that educational administration itself was changing.

5. Although the requirements for license reciprocity varied from one professional group to another, a large majority of the boards for the seven comparative groups except dentistry employed this practice. In contrast, a majority of the dental groups did not use any form of reciprocity.

License reciprocity within each professional group seemed to be a developing characteristic of professionalism. Standardization of license requirements for any one professional group was being improved

by either the various states developing similar, mutually acceptable requirements, or the candidate passing an examination administered by the national society, which was recognized by the state societies.

A little less than half of the educational administration group employed reciprocity, while less than half did not use it at all. It was apparent that license reciprocity for educational administration had not evolved as far as the seven comparative groups.

No conclusions were drawn about limited reciprocity because a majority of all but two groups did not respond to this question.

6. A majority of the boards for all professional groups indicated that appeals were possible if an applicant was refused a license. It was apparent that the professional licensing board policed its ranks and as a result allowed candidates to appeal decisions not in their favor. This aspect of judicial hearings pointed to the fact that professional autonomy included a review of decisions concerning a candidate's licensure.

The educational administration group allowed candidates to appeal decisions not in their favor. It is likely that boards of educational administration composed of lay members, who represent the people of the state, are given power similar to the boards of the other seven professions to hear appeals.

Appeals were made either to the boards, the courts or other bodies or persons. Only a majority of the boards for the nursing group heard appeals, while a majority of boards for the law and the medical groups indicated that appeals were heard by the courts. It seemed that in many states appeal mechanism was determined by statutory decree, rather than by professional society decisions.

The professional groups indicated that the frequency of appeals was negligible. It was determined that either the respondents could not truly recall the actual number of cases, the cases were rare, or the respondents were not sincerely interested in making public the number of appeal cases.

Summary Tabulation of Findings

Table XXIX summarized the major areas of board composition, characteristics, and licensing practices. The educational administration group was shown to be either similar, dissimilar or not possible of comparison with the other seven professions.

Large percentage of board members were male.		
Large percentage of board members were white.		
Most board members were professionals.		
A large percentage of board members were practicing their professions between 11-20 years.		
A large percentage of board members held college degrees.		
A large percentage of board members held degrees in their professional areas.		
A large percentage of board secretaries were female.		

* Except for the law group

* Except for the nursing group

TABLE XXIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS WHICH COMPARED THE SIMILARITY AND DISSIMILARITY
OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION WITH THE BOARDS
FOR SEVEN OTHER SELECTED PROFESSIONS

Area of response	The seven comparative professions and educational administration were:		
	similar	dissimilar	not possible to compare
A large percentage of board members responded		X	
Members were appointed by state governor	X ^a		
A large male membership	X ^b		
Large percentage of members who served on state licensing boards between 2-10 years	X		
Board members were professional practitioners		X	
A large percentage of board members were practicing their professions between 11-40 years		X	
A large percentage of board members held college degrees	X		
A large percentage of members held degrees in their professional areas		X	
A large percentage of board secretaries responded		X	

^a Except for the law group

^b Except for the nursing group

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Area of response	The seven comparative professions and educational administration were:		
	similar	dissimilar	not possible to compare
A large percentage of boards were independent bodies empowered to issue licenses	X ^c		
A code of ethics was established			X ^d
Range of board membership	X		
The board members had to be:			
1. a citizen	X		
2. a state resident	X		
3. a practitioner		X	
4. a lay person		X	
5. of minimum age	X		
6. not beyond a maximum age			X
7. bonded			X
8. experienced, and with		X	
9. minimum professional educational requirements		X	
Average number of meetings a member must attend in one year	X		
State provision for:			
1. office space	X		
2. staff	X		
3. secretary		X	

^c Except for the law group

^d Except for the law group: a large majority of boards adhered to a code of ethics established by the state professional society and the state supreme court.

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Area of response	The seven comparative professions and educational administration were:		
	similar	dissimilar	not possible to compare
Boards were financed by fees or a combination of fees and dues		X	
Fees were turned over to the state, were retained by the board		X	
Board members were reimbursed	X		
The license applicant had to:			
1. complete an application for a specific license	X		
2. file references	X		
3. take a test		X	
4. attend an oral interview			X
5. forward a personal letter	X		
Licenses were obtained by means of examination and a combination of other requirements		X	
The granting of a license was:			
1. discretionary		X ^e	
2. ministerial		X	
If discretionary, the decisions were made by the board		X ^f	
The actual issuance of the license document was delegated	X		

^e Except for the nursing group

^f Except for the law group

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Area of response	The seven comparative professions and educational administration were:		
	similar	dissimilar	not possible to compare
Licenses were issued for life or a specified period	X		
Licenses were renewed upon:			
1. reapplication		X ^g	
2. meeting further educational requirements		X	
Licensing reciprocity was carried on with other states		X ^h	
Was appeal possible	X		
Appeals were made to:			
1. the boards	X		
2. the courts		X	
Frequency of appeals	X		

^g Except for the law group

^h Except for the dentistry group